outside the 3rd Circle.

13/7/81

B.N. 1835 W 26: July 1881

C.E. III Circle ✓
Ex: Br. ✓
Desd
26-7-81

OLS. 10/7. re. 19.7.81.

Ref. to disbursing cheques to the contractors by [illegible]

Issue circular to all S.E.s [illegible] directing them to see that the provision of para 120 of the Code are strictly acted upto and that in no case should accountants be allowed to hand cheques to contractors or in fact have anything to do with disbursements [illegible]

— Also remarks [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

The Hon'ble the Governor

For orders

The accompanying case has arisen out of charges preferred by the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Executive Engineer's Office Trichinopoly Dn. against the Head Clerk of the Supdg. Engineer's Office on the ground that the latter requested the Accountant to levy a black mail of 3 per cent on payments made to contractors receiving payment in the Division Office and to hand the same to him on pain of his incurring his displeasure, being over him in his Division &c.

It is impossible to condense this case in which a number of natives come forward with absolute but unsupported evidence, forming altogether a very pretty intrigue impossible as I honestly admit to unravel —

the story may in its main features be perfectly true and the Head Clerk in the Supd. Engineer's Office may have made an attempt as stated to levy the black mail but if this be the case some of the evidence is to my mind quite incredible

The plaintiffs admit that the communications were in all cases made only to the one individual addressed and the very number of persons to whom the matter was thus as it were exposed militates towards the improbability of the tale — No astute man bent on plunder of this kind would have shewn his hand in this way and if he had done so there would have been other collateral proofs as I cannot but think

The one fact that has an ugly look is that the Head Clerk (Paramasivam Naidu) did apparently interest himself in trying to get a contract for another individual, but even as regards this, as pointed out by Col. Besley he did not proceed in the effectual way that would have readily suggested itself to an astute and anxious rogue

On the whole it has thus seemed to me that the probabilities incline to the view taken by the Supdg. Engineer, and as will be observed this is the view I have taken of the matter in my memo No 116 of the 30th Jany 1881 confirming generally his decision but drawing attention to certain points which have now been answered by the Supd. Engineer in his No 38 C of the 4th July 1881

These latter points do not materially affect the case and I shall deal with them myself departmentally but the tenor of the

Question as coming up for Government decision is that relating to the punishment of the Accountant Muthuswami Naidu whom the Supt. Engineer in the first place on insufficient authority sentenced to dismissal and subsequently on the remonstrance of the Examiner directed to be reduced & transferred

The Examiner in his No 33 W of the 7th May submitted the case for the "information and orders of Government"

Though evidently not concurring with Colonel Beaty in his finding as against the Accountant the Examiner has suggested that the revised sentence of reduction from Rs 70 to 60 per mensem & transfer be carried out at the same time stating that he will be glad if a "less severe punishment" be carried out

For the general reasons I have given above, and in my memo of the 30 May the Accountant practically stands in the light of conspiring with the Head Clerk of the Exe. Engineers Office to ruin the character of the accused, and although as I have said the case is one in regard to which it is difficult to satisfy oneself as to the truth I think he must accept this position, and be made to suffer accordingly

It is also clear to me that the sooner the different individuals who have been mixed up in this matter are separated the better

Owing to the doubts which I have expressed I would not however push the punishment to any great length, and would therefore if the Government assent direct that the Accountant be reduced to Rs 40 per mensem for 3 months, and be transferred to another division in another circle.

All the other [illegible] [illegible] already or will be sufficiently dealt with departmentally.

Mr C Napier has evidently allowed his Accountant to pay own Cheques to Contractors which is opposed to rules as holding out temptations to such men to levy black mail.

These and other irregularities will I presume be stopped by such orders as I can issue and therefore call for no further remark here.

14.7.81

Revised Decision in the matter of the charge brought by the Head Clerk Cundaswami Pillay and Head Accountant Muthuswami Naidu of the Trichinopoly Division against Parancoosum Naidu Head Clerk Superintending Engineer's Office.

Vide demi official dated 4th May 1881.

To meet the wishes of the Examiner, and taking into consideration the strong feeling displayed by Mr. Norfor against Parancoosum Naidu which probably misled and tempted his subordinates, the Supg. Engineer has decided to modify and moderate the sentence he pronounced on the persons engaged in the recent false charge against Parancoosum Naidu.

Cundaswami Pillay lately Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division will be reduced from a pay of Rs 60 in Trichinopoly to Rs 40, as Second Clerk in South Arcot Division Office.

Arunachellam Pillay Sub Overseer 3rd Grade will be suspended for one month and transferred to the Musiri Sub Division; a Sub Overseer of the 3d Grade being transferred from Musiri to Trichinopoly to take his place.-

Muthuswami Naidu will be transferred to the Examiner's Office on a reduced pay of Rs 40, but will do duty in the Trichinopoly Division Office until he is relieved.-

The Original decision will hold good as regards Contractor Iyaswami Pillay

J. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Kodaikanal
12th May/81

the honor to forward a Revised Decision and to request you will be good enough to send an accountant to relieve Muthuswami Naidu at your earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obdt. Servt.
R Beatty. Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

[illegible] 19/5

Ord 19/5

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MADRAS, 19th MAY 1881.

NO. 43 W

[illegible] not recd. at [illegible] 20/5

SIR,

IN CONTINUATION OF MY NO. 33 W DATED 7TH. MAY 1881, I HAVE THE HONOR TO SUBMIT, IN ORIGINAL, REVISED DECISION OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 3RD. CIRCLE, IN THE MATTER OF THE TRICHINOPOLY ACCOUNTANT'S CASE, RECEIVED WITH SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S NO. 227 T.C. OF 17TH. INSTANT.

2. THE DEMI-OFFICIAL REFERRED TO IN THE MARGIN OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S DECISION, WAS ONE IN WHICH I PROPOSED THE TRANSFER AND REDUCTION OF THE ACCOUNTANT INSTEAD OF HIS DISMISSAL, SO STRONGLY URGED BY THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER. THE 'SENTENCE' NOW PRONOUNCED IS, NO DOUBT, INTENDED AS A RECOMMENDATION, FOR SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER HAS NO AUTHORITY TO ORDER THE TRANSFER, WHICH LIES WITH GOVERNMENT ON MY RECOMMENDATION.

3. I WOULD REQUEST THE RETURN OF THIS ORIGINAL DOCUMENT WITH THE OTHER ORIGINALS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FOR THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

I.

I HAVE THE HONOR TO BE,

SIR,

YOUR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT.

wm
19/5
14

EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS.

PWC No. 3282

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
P.W. DEPARTMENT.

NO. 43 W

DATED 19 MAY 1881.

RECD.

ENCLOSURE 2.

Entd. in Receipt Regr.

FORWARDS COPY OF LETTER FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER 3RD. CIRCLE REGARDING REVISED DECISION IN CASE OF ACCOUNTANT MOOTHOOSAWMY NAIDU.

OLS. 32/5

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS,
MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NO. 33 W MADRAS, 7 MAY 1881.

SIR,

I HAVE THE HONOR TO SUBMIT FOR THE INFORMATION OF GOVERNMENT THE ACCOMPANYING FILE OF ORIGINAL PAPERS RECEIVED UNDER COVER OF LETTER NO. 152 T.C. OF 2ND. INSTANT, FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 3RD. CIRCLE, TOGETHER WITH A MEMO THEREON, IN WHICH MY VIEWS OF THE CASE ARE EXPRESSED.

2. I BEG TO BE FURNISHED WITH THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT REGARDING MY PROPOSAL TO REDUCE AND TRANSFER THE ACCOUNTANT OF THE TRICHINOPOLY DIVISION. THE MAN IS AT PRESENT DRAWING RS. 70 PER MENSEM AND THE REDUCTION WOULD BRING HIM TO RS. 40; SHOULD GOVERNMENT BE PLEASED TO TAKE A MORE LENIENT VIEW OF THE CASE, I SHALL BE ONLY TOO GLAD THAT A LESS SEVERE PUNISHMENT SHOULD RESULT.

3. EARLY ORDERS ARE SOLICITED; AS ALSO THE RETURN OF THE ORIGINAL PAPERS NOW SUBMITTED.

I HAVE THE HONOR TO BE,
SIR,
YOUR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT.

J. C. Conway
EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS.

W 7/5

P. W. C. No 30

FROM THE EXAMINER P. W. ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

NO. 33 W

DATED 7th MAY 1881.

RECD. 19th —"—

ENCLOSURES.

SUBMITS THE CASE OF THE ACCOUNTANT TRICHINOPOLY DIVISION FOR THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

Entd. in Receipt Regr.

O.S. 12/5

O.S. 3/5

3

No. 1835 W **PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.**

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 26th July 1881.

Read the following :—

1

From The Examiner, P.W. Accounts } (No: 33 W of 7th May/81)

" Do do - (" 43 W " 19th — do —)

" The Supt. Engineer III Circle } (" 2038 C " 4th July/81)

The papers read above refer to charges against the Head Clerk of the office of the Supdg: Engineer 3rd Circle, brought forward by the Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer's Office, Trichinopoly Division, and the Divisional Accountant, Muthuswamy Naidu.

R.S.

The case as affecting the two Head Clerks has already been considered and disposed of by the Supdg: Engineer and the Chief Engineer, the Accountant Mu:thusawmy Naidu now remains to be dealt with.

After a review of all the correspon:dence, the Honorable the Governor in Council considers ~~that~~ the conduct of the Accountant in preferring grave charges against another subordinate, which he has failed to substantiate has been reprehensible. As a punishment for the ~~discreditable~~ part which he has taken in the proceedings, Muthusawmy Naidu will be reduced from Rs 70 to Rs 40 per men:sem for 3 months; and be transferred, under the orders of the Examiner, to another Division

OLS. 32/5

OLS. 12/5

outside the 3rd Circle.

17/7/81

B.N. 1835 W 26 July 1881

S.E. IIIrd Circle ✓
Ex: BWD. ✓

Desd
26-7-81

O.L.S. 10/7. m.19.7.81.

O.L.S. 12/5

O.L.S. 32/5

From, P.W.C. No 3943
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No 38 C

Dated 4th July 1881
Recd 8 — do

Enclo - 11

Payments to contractors in Trichino-poly Division -

Reports the result of enquiries as to how ---- were made by the late Offg Executive Engineer -

Entd in Receipt Regr.

m.19.7.81
6.8.7.81 O.L.S. 10/7.
Q. 25/7/81

outside the 3rd Circle.

13/7/81

B.N. 1835 W/ 26th July 1881

S.E. III Circle ✓
Ex: P.W.D. ✓
Despd
26-7-81

O.L.S. 10/7. Rc. 19-7-81.

O.L.S. 12/5

O.L.S. 32/5

From, P.W.C. No 3943
The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle
To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No 38 C

Dated 4th July 1881
Recd 8 — do

Enclo. 11

Payments to contractors in Trichinopoly Division.

Reports the result of enquiries as to how ---- were made by the late Offg Executive Engineer.

Entd in Receipt Regr.

Rc. 19-7-81
O. 8.7.81 O.L.S. 10/7.
O. 25/7/81

He now explains that the meaning he intended to convey was that "as he had not been in the habit of collecting money from Contractors, he did not understand how it was to be done".

8. I have called the attention of all Divisional officers to the orders prohibiting the payment of Contractors or Suppliers by imprest holders or any Subordinate; and that the term subordinate includes Clerks and accountants. I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obdt. Servt.

J. Beatty - Lt. Col. R.E.

Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

---

5. I enquired of Mr. Norfor whether he had any Statement he desired to make, and I send his reply. From this it would appear that he was not aware of the Orders of Government that Cheques were not to be "conveyed" to Contractors "directly or indirectly through the medium of Subordinates". He seems also to have imagined that part of the duty of a Cashier, if one were appointed to his Division, would be to relieve him of the duty of handing over cheques direct to the Contractors.

6. It seems to me certain that while Mr. Norfor was in charge of the Trichinopoly Division a large proportion of the cheques to Contractors were delivered to them through the Accountant.

7. With regard to the Accountant's Statement that,

"He did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the contractors".

the effect that while Mr. Manson was in charge of the Division, the Cheques were delivered to the Contractors by that Officer personally; but that subsequently, except on two occasions, they received the Cheques from the Accountant.

The depositions of the other Contractors taken several days later and at or near head quarters, are not so reliable, as being open to the suspicion that the Contractors had been advised what they should say.

3. It seems to have been usual with the Contractors to come to Trichinopoly to be paid. They would sometimes deliver their Bill to Mr. Norfor, but it seems to have been more the custom to deliver the Bill to the Accountant, who would check it, obtain a cheque from the Divisional Officer and deliver it to the Contractor. Some of the Contractors however state they received Cheques direct from Mr. Norfor, took them to the Accountant, and then received them back; if this were really the case the Contractors were put to a good deal of unnecessary trouble.

4. The Accountant was called on for his explanation as to how it happened that cheques were sometimes handed over to Contractors by him:– He states that "when Contractors were present they got the cheques direct from the Divisional officer," at other times from him. But as the Contractors came to Trichinopoly to deliver their Bills, and receive payment, they would always be present to receive their cheques; unless the Divisional Officer happened to be absent, in which case they would no doubt deliver the bills to the Accountant, and receive their cheque from him on their next visit.

There was clearly no necessity for the cheque passing through the Accountant's hands at all, as the Counterfoil was with the Divisional Officer, and it would give the name, date and amount.

5. I enquired of Mr. Norfor whether he had any Statement he desired to make, and I send his reply. — From this it would appear that he was not aware of the Orders of Government that Cheques were not to be "conveyed" to Contractors "directly or indirectly through the medium of Subordinates". He seems also to have imagined that part of the duty of a Cashier, if one were appointed to his Division, would be to relieve him of the duty of handing over cheques direct to the Contractors.

6. It seems to me certain that while Mr. Norfor was in charge of the Trichinopoly Division a large proportion of the cheques to Contractors were delivered to them through the Accountant.

7. With regard to the Accountant's Statement that,

"He did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors".

O.L.S. 32/5

P. W. 3943/10
1

2709
13.6.10.

From.
C. H. J. Norfor Esq.
Actg Engineer
Negapatam.
to The Supdg Engineer
3rd Circle
Thro' Ex Engineer
Negapatam.

Dated 11th } June/10
Recd }
No 28

Affording explanation regarding certain points raised by the Chief Engr relating to the subordinates of disbursement of cheques by the accountant office Trichinopoly Division.

No 2662

Forwarded
12.6.10.
Exe Engr

as it was discretional with the Ex. Engineer to make the arrangement under para 1257 of the P. W. Code; Govt. not having appointed a Cashier.

3. I informed you the same later on, and requested you to obtain the sanction of Government, to the appointment of a Cashier, for the Trichy Division, as I considered that my Accountant had quite enough to do without writing up the Cash Book.

4. I do not know what action, if any, you have taken on my letter.

5. I considered that whoever kept the Cash Book should disburse money — the Accountant has kept it for years past.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt. Servant

Assistant Engineer

P. W. 3943/81
1

2709
13-6-81.

From.

C H T. Norfor Esq.
Asstt Engineer
Negapatam

To The Supdg Engineer
3rd Circle
Thro' Ex Engineer
Negapatam.

Dated 11th } June/81
Recd

No 8

Affording Explanation regarding certain points raised by the Chief Engr relating to the entrusting of disbursement of cheques by the accountant of the Trichinopoly Divn.

No 2662

Forwarded
A...
12.6.81.
Exe Engr

U.L.S. 32/5

PW 3943/81
2-1

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Divn

To
The Supdg Engineer
Third Circle

No. 999

Dated 20th } June/81
Despd. 20th
Recd. 21st

En: 9

Disbursement of Cheques to Contractors — Submits enquiries made regarding ~~this~~ the Accts.

P. W. 3943/81
1

2709
13-6-81.

From.
C. H. J. Norfor Esq.
Asstt Engineer
Negapatam
To The Supg Engineer
3d Circle
Thro' Ex Engineer
Negapatam.
Dated 11th } June/81
Recd }
No 8
Affording Explanation regarding certain points raised by the Chief Engr relating to the entrusting of disbursement of cheques by the accountant of the Trichinopoly Divisn

No 2662
Forwarded
R. C. N.
Exe Engr

No 999

Trichinopoly Division Office
Trichinopoly 20th June 1881

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

Sir,

Enclosures
8 - Depositions of Contractors
1 - Explanation of Acctt.
9

With reference to your No. 3087C of
the 2d Instant directing me to make enquire
regarding the Cheques that have been han
-ed over to Contractors thro' the Accountan
of this Office I have the honor to inform
you that I have examined 8 Contractor
and submit a summary of their replies:

(1) Contractor Rungasami Naidu wa
examined by me on the 2d Instant
at the Upper Anicut and his depos
-tion is to the effect that he received
Cheques directly from the Offices during
Mr Manson's charge and subsequen
-ly thro' the Accountant after signing
the bills with him and he did not

at any time receive from the Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the Accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 6 Cheques amounting to Rs 763.

(2) Contractor Ramies was examined the same date at the same place also & he deposed that except on one occasion in February last he received all his Cheques thro' the Accountant & he did not receive at any time from Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 8 Cheques amounting to Rs 4196

(3) Contractor Rungananda Chetty was also examined on the same date at the Upper Anicut. He stated that he only once received Cheque direct from Mr Norfor at Kuldalai & except on this occasion he received always thro' the Head Accounts and did not receive at any time from Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 7 Cheques amounting to Rs 2450.

(4) Contractor Ramasamy Pillay was examined by me at Office on the 10th. His Statement is that he received Cheques both from the Accountant & Mr Norfor and the greater extent was direct from the Officer and some he received from the Head Clerk. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 17 Cheques amounting to Rs 12541.

(5) Contractor Marudanayagam Pillay was examined at Office on the 13th. He stated he received Cheques both from the Accountant & Mr Norfor and the extent of transactions has been equal. Did not at all receive from the Head Clerk. I find from the Accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 9 Cheques amounting to Rs 2612.

(6) Contractor Baboo Saib was examined also at Office on the 13th. He deposed he received Cheques direct always from the Officer but delivered them to the Accounts for entry & got them back from the Accts. Never received from the Head Clerk. I

I find from the Account that this man in Mr Nosfor's time received 6 Cheques amounting to Rs 1316.

(7) Contractor Annasamy Iyer who was also examined at Office on the 13th deposed to the same effect as Baboo Saib. I find from the Account that this man in Mr Nosfor's time received 5 Cheques amounting to Rs 663.

(8) Contractor Rungier was examined by me at Srirungum on the 14th & his deposition is also the same as that given by the 6th and 7th Contractors. I find from the Account that this man in Mr Nosfor's time received 12 Cheques amounting to Rs 5522.

II The written depositions of these Contractors are herewith submitted. Of these 8 men, 3 deposed to having received the Cheques almost invariably from the Account, 2 partly from the Officer & partly from the Accountant and the 3 remaining always directly from the Officer but gave them to the Accountant for entry and redelivery.

III The Accountant's written explanation is also herewith sent as directed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
Offg Ex. Engineer T.C. Division

Br 3943/81
2-1

From The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Divn

To The Supdg Engineer
Third Circle

No. 999

Dated 20th }
Despd. 20th } June/81
Recd. 21st }

En: 9

Disbursement of Cheques to Contractors — Submits enquiries made regarding — thro' the Acctt.

Br 3943/81
3

8
15/6/81

Trichinopoly 15 June 1881

To

The Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Dn

Sir

With reference to your Endorsement on Supy Engineers Memo=
=randum No 308 IC of 2 June 1881 asking me for explanation of the points raised by the Chief Engineer in paras 5 to 9 of his Memorandum No 116 of 30th May 1881 I beg to offer my explanations on ~~the~~ your queries as follow

1st Query - "Explain the expression "he did not understand in what way he was to make Collections from ~~the~~ Contractors"

The above words were a reply given by me to a question put at ~~the~~ the enquiry held by the Supy Engr as to how Collections are made from Contractors for Paravacotsum Naidu, by stating ~~the~~ above the meaning I intended to convey was ~~that~~ as I had not been in the habit of Collecting money from

Nr 3943/81
4

8
15/6/81

Trichinopoly 15 June 1881

To
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement on Supt Engineers Memorandum No 308 IC d/ 2 June 1881 asking me for explanation of the points raised by the Chief Engineer in paras 5 to 9 of his Memorandum No 116 d/ 30th May 1881 I beg to offer my explanations on ~~the~~ your queries as follows

1st Query. "Explain the expression "he did not understand in what way he was to make Collections from the Contractors"

The above words were a reply given by me to a question put at ~~the~~ the enquiry held by the ~~Supdt~~ Supy Engr as to how Collections are ~~this~~ made from Contractors for Paramesvaran Naidu, by stating ~~the~~ above the meaning I intended to convey was that ~~as~~ I had not been in the habit of Collecting money from

---

Deposition given by Contractor Rungasawmy Naidu regarding the practice with him to obtain ~~this~~ his cheques on Bills submitted by him.

Mr. Manson [illegible] charge [illegible] cheque [illegible]. Mr. Horsfor [illegible] charge [illegible] Bill [illegible] [illegible]	I used to receive cheques direct from Mr. Manson while he was in charge; & when Mr. Horsfor was in charge I used to receive cheques from the Accountant after signing the bills with the Accountant. I did not receive at any time from Mr. Horsfor or at his Bungalow. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Cundasawmy Pillay.

[illegible]

Subrachari
2/6/81.
Camp [illegible]

No 3943/11

Deposition given by Contractor Ramier regarding the practice with him about in his cheques or bills submitted by him.

[illegible]

I used to deliver bill to Mr Horsfor who sends it to the Office for checking. No sooner had the bill been checked than I used to sign it & receive cheque from the Accountant. I do not, in my experience, recollect to have received at any time from Mr Horsfor at his Bungalow. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Kandasamy Pillay. It was customary to deliver the bills also to the Accountant.

Since stating the above what crossed my memory is that I received only once (February) a cheque direct from the gentleman & delivered the same to the Acctt.; and on my affixing my signature to the bill I got it back given to me.

Subyeelaam

[illegible]

2/6/87. Camp Upper Anicut

Mr 3943/17
10

Deposition given by Contractor Runganatha chetty regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques on Bills submitted by him.

[illegible] Bill [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] check [illegible]
[illegible] Cheque [illegible]
[illegible] Bill [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] Cheque [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] cheque [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

I used to deliver bill to the Accountant in the Office, who, on checking it, used to obtain the cheque from the Officer & deliver it to me after getting the bill signed by me. I did not receive cheque direct from the Officer in the Gentleman's House. I had only once received cheque direct from the Officer at Coottallay. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Cundasawmy Pillay.

A. Runganatha chetty

A. Subrochari
2/6/81.

No 3943/17
10

Deposition given by Contractor Runganatha Chetty regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques or Bills submitted by him.

நான் Bill கொண்டுபோய் ஆபீசில் அக்கவுண்டண் [illegible] Check [illegible] [illegible] Cheque [illegible] [illegible] Bill [illegible] [illegible] Cheque [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] cheque [illegible] [illegible]	I used to deliver bill ~~to the~~ Accountants in the Office, who, on checking ~~it~~ used to obtain the cheque from the Officer & deliver it to me after getting the bill signed by me. I did not receive cheque ~~direct from the Officer~~ in the Gentleman's House. I had only once received cheque direct from the Officer at Coatitalay. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Cundasamy Pillay.

C. Runganatha Chetty

A. Subrayachari
2/6/87.

No 3943/b
9

Deposition of Contractor Ramasamy Pillay with respect to obtaining his cheques.

[illegible] Bill [illegible]
[illegible] Accountant [illegible]
[illegible]
Check [illegible] cheque
[illegible]
Mr Korfor [illegible] Head Quarter
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] Accountant
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
Clerk [illegible]
[illegible]

I used to deliver bill to the Accountant in the Office; he used to check the same & to obtain the cheque & deliver it to me. When Mr Korfor was in the Head Quarter it was also customary to receive direct as well from him as from the Accountant in the Office. Greater part of receiving my cheques was direct from the gentleman. I did not receive direct from Clerk Cundasamy pillay

[illegible] Ramasamy Pillai
Contractor

10/6/82.

1881

No 3943/F
8

Deposition by Contractor Maruthanayagam pillay with reference to his practice in obtaining cheques:-

நான் Bill கொடுத்து
Mr. Foster துரையவர்களிடம்
நேரிலும் Cheque
பெற்றுக் கொண்டு
வந்திருக்கிறேன் - அதுவுமின்றி
Accountant மூலமாய்
யும் பெற்றுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறேன் -
துரையவர்களிடம் நேரில்
வாங்குவதும் அந்த
[illegible]
[illegible] Head clerk
[illegible]
Head clerk கந்தசாமி
பிள்ளையிடம் வாங்குவது
இல்லை -

மருதநாயகம்பிள்ளை

I had received cheque direct from ~~Mr~~ Mr Foster on presenting bill, & so ~~thro' the Accountant~~ also in the Office. The receipt of cheque direct from the gentleman, & thro' ~~the Accountant~~ will be equal in extent. It is not customary to receive cheque from Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay.

A Subrachari
13/6/81.

Fw 5943/87

Deposition by Contractor Babro Saheb as to his practice in obtaining Cheques.

[illegible] Accountant [illegible] Check [illegible] bill [illegible] cheque [illegible] Accountant [illegible] cheque [illegible] cheque [illegible] Head clerk [illegible]	I used to deliver bill to the [illegible] & on his giving it to me after checking I used to deliver it to the gentleman, & receive cheque direct from him afterwards; the cheque is presented to the Accountant; and on getting it entered by him I used to receive it back from him - I always received cheques only from the gentleman - I did not receive from the clerk Cundasamy Pillay.

No 3943/87

Deposition by Cutcheri Babro sahib as to his practice in obtaining cheques.

[illegible] Accountant [illegible]	I used to deliver bill to the Acctt;
[illegible] Check [illegible]	& on his giving it to me after checking
[illegible] Bill	I used to deliver it to the gentleman, &
[illegible] cheque [illegible]	receive cheque direct from him
[illegible] Accountant	afterwards; the cheque is presented
[illegible]	to the Accountant, and on getting it entered
[illegible]	by him I used to
[illegible] cheque [illegible]	receive it back from him. I
[illegible]	always received
[illegible] cheque [illegible]	cheques only from the gentleman. I
[illegible] Head clerk [illegible]	did not receive from the clerk
[illegible]	Cundasamy Pillay.

[illegible]

Boty 21-5-87.

Br 3943/81
5

Deposition by Calcutta Rungier with reference to practice in obtaining his cheques:-

[illegible] bill Account [illegible]	I used to deliver bill
[illegible] check [illegible]	to the Accountant, &
[illegible] Cheque [illegible]	on his checking the
[illegible] Account [illegible]	same I used to
[illegible]	present it & obtain
[illegible]	cheque direct from
[illegible]	the gentleman; afterwards
[illegible] cheque [illegible]	I used to take & show
[illegible] present [illegible]	the cheque to the
[illegible]	Accountant; and
[illegible] cheque	after its entry in his
[illegible] Head clerk	books, I used to
[illegible]	get it back.
Cheque [illegible]	Sometimes the Acctt used to send for the cheque & deliver it to me. The number of cheques I received direct from the gentleman used to be much more than I got thro' the Acctt. I used not to receive cheque from Hd clerk

A Subrahmanian
14/6/81.

Candasamy Pillay

[illegible] to Coty 21-5-81.

[illegible]

Nr 3943/81
4

[illegible]

11/6/81.

Establishment
P.W.C.A. 3050

From,
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 211 E.C.

Dated 16th May 1881
Recd 20 May.

Enclo: 60.

Memo: No 116 d/ 30 May/81

Forwarding Appeal from Mr. Norfor against a decision of the Supg Engineer.

[illegible] to Coty 21-5-81.

[illegible]

Nr 3943/81
4

[illegible]

11/6/81.

P.W. Dept.

Memorandum No. 116 d/ 30th May 1881.

Letter from the Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle No. 211 S.C. d/ 16th May 1881.

Petition from K. Cundasamy pillay, Head Clerk, Executive Engineer's Office, Trichinopoly d/ 18th May/81.

—

The Chief Engineer must decline to interfere with the decision of the Supg. Engineer in this case.

2. Accusations preferred with altogether insufficient proof must necessary be viewed with suspicion, and the consequences of such injudicious action must be accepted.

3. Mr. Norfor has, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer, displayed marked want of judgment in giving support and countenance to proceedings of this character - and has further violated the confidence due to the Superintending Engineer by withholding, till specially called for, the

4. There are other features in the case which under ordinary circumstances, would call for severe animadversion, but seeing that Mr. Norfor's conduct in connection with another matter has quite recently come under the unfavorable notice of Government, and has led to his removal from his Division, the Chief Engineer is unwilling to add more on the present occasion than to express the hope that Mr. Norfor will profit by the lessons he has already received, and will act with greater discretion in future.

5. There is, however, one point regarding which further information is required. In para 33 of the Supy. Engineer's Proceedings of 28th April 1881, Muthusamy Naidu is represented to have stated that "he did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division [illegible]."

18th May 1881

unintelligible, and the man should be called on to explain his meaning.

7. If, as he says, cheques passed through his hands, does he wish it to be believed that he did not know how to levy black mail? The Chief Engineer can understand the man advancing the plea that although money thus passed through his hands, he valued his character too highly to extort contributions. But the words taken as they stand are, if properly reported, audacious in their effrontery.

8. The reply suggests the further enquiry as to the circumstances under which this man has, contrary to the express orders of Government, been placed in a position involving the disbursement of funds, and to what extent the irregularity has been allowed.

9. Mr. Norfor must be aware that, not only is such an arrangement contrary to the rules of the Department, but that if this man [illegible] temptation, he is

4. There are other features in the case which, under ordinary circumstances, would call for severe animadversion, but seeing that Mr. Norfor's conduct in connection with another matter has quite recently come under the unfavorable notice of Government, and has led to his removal from his Division, the Chief Engineer is unwilling to add more on the present occasion than to expreſs the hope that Mr. Norfor will profit by the leſsons he has already received, and will act with greater discretion in future.

5. There is, however, one point regarding which further information is required. In para 33 of the Supg Engineer's Proceedings of 28th April 1881, Muthusamy Naidu is represented to have stated that "he did not understand in what "way he was to make collections from the "Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques "sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division " M."

unintelligible, and the man should be called on to explain his meaning.

7. If, as he says, cheques paſsed through his hands, does he wish it to be believed that he did not know how to levy black mail? The Chief Engineer can understand the man advancing the plea that although money thus paſsed through his hands, he valued his character too highly to extort contributions. But the words taken as they stand are, if properly reported, audacious in their effrontery.

8. The reply suggests the further enquiry as to the circumstances under which this man has, contrary to the expreſs orders of Government, been placed in a position involving the disbursement of funds, and to what extent the irregularity has been allowed.

9. Mr. Norfor must be aware that, not only is such an arrangement contrary to the rules of the Department, but that if this man [illegible] temptation, he is

18/5/95

himself much to blame. Before dealing further on this point, however, the Chief Engineer must request the Supg. Engineer to investigate it fully & report thereon

Mems No. 116 of 30th Ma

10. In conclusion the Chief Engineer must observe that there is evidence throughout these proceedings that writers in offices interest themselves in the matter of obtaining contracts for Public Works, and advocating individual claims. The practice is open to the gravest abuse, and the Chief Engineer must therefore look to the Supg. Engineer to discountenance it by all the weight of his authority.

(Sd.) R A Sankey, Col R.E.
Chief Engineer, P.W. Dept.

Ootacamund

(Intd.) R.S.
C.A.W.

M. To, The Sub

18th May 1881

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

The humble appeal of M. Cundasamy
Pillay Head Clerk Executive Engineer's
Office Trichinopoly Division

Most Respected Sir

Enclosures
1. Copy of Testimonials
1. Copy of depositions

With due respect and profound submission I beg most respectfully to submit for your honor's kind consideration, this my humble appeal against my unjust dismissal from the Department.

In submitting the same I am perfectly aware that I am appealing against the decision passed by the Supg. Engineer, but nevertheless relying on the justice of the same I venture to make this appeal.

I have been 11 years employed in the Dept. bearing an unblemished reputation throughout, as the several testimonials (copies enclosed), given to me will amply testify.

I have been dismissed on the charge of having made a false complaint against the Head Clerk of the Supg. Engr's office in having stated ~~that~~ he had asked me to obtain for him a commission of 3 per cent on all payments made to Contractors & which the Supg. Engineer after an inconclusive enquiry declared ~~that~~ such did not take place & ~~that~~ I was actuated solely by malicious motives.

18th November/72

7 10

Capt. R.E.
Executive Engr

I beg most solemnly to declare that such is not the fact, in as much as we have been most particular friends & I had no personal motive to bring such a charge against him.

Paramasivam Naidu Head Clerk Supdg Engrs office having urged me to collect for him 3 per cent on all payments made to Contractors I deemed it to be my duty to bring the matter to the notice of the Executive Engineer (my immediate superior) & I accordingly did early in December last. Again the subject was urged upon me by Sub overseer Arunachellam Pillay & Contractor Gurusawmy Pillay (vide copies of their depositions enclosed) of which I took no notice as the subject had been brought before my immediate superior.

Severe warnings & threats having since been received from the Supdg Engrs office I was compelled to solicit the Executive Engineer by writing to convey the fact to the notice of ~~the~~ Supdg Engineer as I thought the animadversions of the Supdg Engineer under the misrepresentation of his Head Clerk had not been justified. The Executive Engineer having enquired into the matter submitted my petition to the Supdg Engineer with his letter No 4192 dated 7th March /81.

It will be perceived that the Supdg Engineer has not called upon his Head Clerk to explain the charges brought against him, but on the other hand, it is palpable that with [illegible] view of supporting his Head Clerk the case against me may be attributed.

I beg to offer my defence on each point of the Supdg Engineer's decision.

In para 4 of the General remarks of the Supdg Engineer he states that the evidence of 2 witnesses to prove the charge against the Head Clerk of the Supdg Engineer's office is perfectly worthless & such as would not be accepted in any Court of Law & in Paras 20 & 25 of the Proceedings the Supdg Engineer declares his conviction ~~that~~ the evidence is perfectly substantiated. worthless not being in any way

I humbly beg to state that no one would dare speak matters of this kind in the presence of a third person & that Head Clerk Paramasivam Naidu had not in any manner disproved the statement given by the witnesses in support of the charge.

With regard to the latter part of para 6 of the Supdg Engineer's general remarks I beg to submit that on the day of enquiry I was only asked to state how Paramasivam Naidu expected me to collect for him the percentage my reply to this was as that contained in para 41 of the Proceedings, that is, "I do not know how Paramasivam Naidu expected me to collect money".

In respect of para 8 of the Supdg Engineer's general remarks I beg to submit that not being placed under the direct orders of the Supdg Engineer he consequently can know little of

18th November/72

Capt. [illegible]
Executive Engr

K.D.C. No. 2289

Copies of Testimonials

K. Cundasawmy Pillay has been a volunteer in this office for 10 months and for some weeks as acting Copyist. He writes a very fair hand and seems to be a deserving youth.

(Signed) H. L. Prendergast
Captain R.E.
Offg Supdg Engr 8th Dn

8th April 1870.

K. Cundasawmy Pillay has been employed as a volunteer & Copyist in the Supdg Engineer's office 8th Division from March 1869. He is now acting 2nd Copyist. He has performed his duties satisfactorily.

(Signed) G. M. Payne
Major
M.S.C.
Offg Supdg Engr 8th Dn

28th February 1871.

K. Cundasawmy Pillay the Acting Assistant accountant & writer of the Dindigul Range office is a first class penman has been very industrious since he has been in the Range & gets through an unusually large amount of work in a day. He is very neat & careful in the keeping of his records & has given me cause to be well satisfied with him.

(Signed) H. Lyon Asst. Engr
In Chge of 2nd Range

10th April 1872.

During the time I have been in charge of the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay intelligent and accurate as well as painstaking and have no doubt he will be a useful Offi man as he gets older.

(Signed) John Pennycuick
Captn R.E.
Executive Engr

18th November /72.

During the time I have been in charge of the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay intelligent & accurate as well as painstaking & have no doubt he will be a useful office man as he gets older. I have been very well pleased with the way he does his work.

22nd March/73.

/Signed/ W. Coningham Captn R.E.
Executive Engr Dl. Range

During the short period in which I have been recently in charge of the Dindigul Range, I have found Mr. Cundasawmy Pillay, the Assistant Accountant & writer of the Range to be painstaking accurate & intelligent, and to be fully deserving of his present appointment to which I had much pleasure in nominating him.

/Signed/ R. A. Roberts
Lt. Col. R.E.
Dt. Engr Madura
In temporary Chge of
Dindigul Range.

Madura
15th April/73

During the time I have been in charge of the Range 12 months I have always found Cundasawmy hardworking, painstaking and accurate. He has a good head & is a tolerably quick & a good penman & can get through a large amount of work in a day.

24th May/1876.

/Signed/ O. V. Boddy Lt. R.E.
Executive Engr

Was promoted & brought into this office by me as I had long observed his intelligence, usefulness & careful working with punctual attendance at office at all times: he is well deserving of further advancement.

/Signed/ J. H. Fischer
Colonel R.E.
District Engineer Madura

Madura
18th December/76.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been accountant in the District Engineer's office, Madura, since I have been in charge and before. I entirely agree in the opinion expressed by Colonel Fischer regarding him, he is quick, well mannered, punctual and intelligent, I think him deserving of a higher post. He leaves my office now for that of the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle District Engineers having been done away with.

/Signed/ W. S. Harington
District Engineer

Madura
17th Novr/78.

Cundasawmy Pillay was employed in my office 6 months as accountant in charge of ~~the preparation~~ appropriation Registers &c. graded as 3rd Clerk. I found him hardworking intelligent & accordingly promoted him to be Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division office.

/Sd/ J. W. Rundall
Actg Supg Engr 5th Circle

21st May/79.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been Head Clerk in this office since 22nd May/1879 & I have found him very hardworking, willing and intelligent and in all respects well qualified

During the time I have been in charge of
the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay
intelligent & accurate as well as painstaking
& have no doubt he will be a useful office
man as he gets older. I have been very well
pleased with the way he does his work.

22nd March/73.

/Signed/ W. Coningham Captn R.E.
Executive Engr. Dl. Range

During the short period in which I
have been recently in charge of the Dindigul
Range, I have found M. Cundasawmy Pillay, the
Assistant Accountant & writer of the Range
to be painstaking accurate & intelligent, and
to be fully deserving of his present appoint-
-ment to which I had much pleasure in
nominating him.

Madura
15th April/73

/Signed/ R. A. Roberts
Lt Col R.E.
Dt Engr. Madura
& temporary Chge of
Dindigul Range.

During the time I have been in charge of
the Range 12 months. I have always found
Cundasawmy hard working, painstaking and
accurate. He has a good head & is a tolerably
quick & a good penman & can get through
a large amount of work in a day.

24th May/1876.

/Signed/ O. V. Boddy Lt R.E.
Executive Engr.

Was promoted & brought into this office
by me as I had long observed his intelligence,
usefulness & careful working with punctual
attendance at office at all times: he is
well deserving of further advancement.

/Signed/ J. F. Fischer
Colonel R.E.
District Engineer Madura

Madura
18th December/76.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been accountant
in the District Engineer's office, Madura, since
I have been in charge, and before. I entirely agree
in the opinion expressed by Colonel Fischer
regarding him, he is quick, well mannered,
punctual and intelligent, I think him
deserving of a higher post. He leaves my
office now for that of the Superintending
Engineer 5th Circle District Engineers having
been done away with.

/Signed/ W. S. Harington.
District Engineer

Madura
17th Novr/78.

Cundasawmy Pillay was employed in my
office 6 months as accountant in charge of
~~the preparation~~ appropriation Registers &c &
graded as 3rd Clerk. I found him hardworking
intelligent & accordingly promoted him to
be Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division office.

/Sd/ J. W. Rundall
Offg Supg Engr. 5th Circle

21st May/79.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been Head
Clerk in this office since 22nd May/1879 &
I have found him very hardworking, willing
and intelligent and in all respects well
qualified

qualified for his post.

4th November/79. (Signed) H. Smalley Major R.E.
Executive Engineer

K. Cundasawmy has served as Head Clerk of the Trichinopoly Division office under me for 9 months; He was the Head Clerk on my arrival in August 1880 - a more painstaking & hardworking man I have seldom met with - he makes himself thoroughly acquainted with all correspondence & writes a good hand & can draft letters well - I believe him to be thoroughly honest.

3283/

4th May 1881. (Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr
Trichinopoly Dn

(True copies)

Copies of Depositions

About 2 months ago I was going to the Division Stores to get a Levelling Instrument for levelling in the Kothamangalam Tank the Supt Engineer's Head Clerk was walking in the verandah near the office - he saw me & called me & conversed with me about his sister's marriage and the extra expenses that had occurred during the marriage. He also told me that he had requested the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Division Office to collect a percentage for him. He told me that it is he that had recommended Cundasawmy for the Head Clerk's post in this Division and that it was through his influence that Muthusawmy Naidu was transferred from the Examiner's Office to this Office. I did this, he said, thinking they would be great assistance to me, but now they are not so, he requested me to advise them not to gain his displeasure. I said very well I will inform them & accordingly I did so.

(Sd.) (Signed) C. M. Arunachellam Pillay
3rd grade Sub overseer
15/3/81

I am a Contractor in this District and my name is Iyasawmy Pillay. The Supt Engineer's manager called me about 2 months ago

ago, during Pongal he asked me if I gave the Overseer or the Dn office people any percentage on ~~the~~ contracts ~~that~~ I get - I replied that I gave nothing - To which the Head Clerk said, Oh all ~~the~~ Contractors say the same but I believe ~~that~~ the Dn Office people get some-thing from you all - Please go & inform the Dn office Head Clerk that I have already spoken on the matter to him & I have also sent word through some other individuals & if he does not yield to my request & give a percentage he will get my displeasure - He also informed me ~~that~~ he gets percentage regularly from the other 4 Divisions - He told me I must bring him an answer soon - I immediately informed the Dl Head Clerk who told me that he would not interfere in the matter - I did not go again to the Superintending Engineer's Head Clerk - I informed this to the Division Head Accountant also

(Signed) S. Iyasawmy Pillay
14/3/81

(True copies)

323/2

A Genl. No. 116 dd
30th May 1881

Ol1. 32/5

Bangalore
17th May 1881

Colonel R. H. Sankey C.B.
Royal Engineers
Ootacamund

Sir

I beg to be pardoned the liberty which I have in the present instance taken to bring the following circumstance to your notice, in the sincere hope that you will be so good as to bestow towards it a favorable consideration.

I beg to state, that the Bearer of this R. Cundasawmy Pillay late Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer's Office, Trichinopoly Division, is as I am informed now dismissed from the Public Service without a just investigation into his Case by the Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle, on the instigation, and under the impression that he Cundasawmy Pillay had brought a false complaint against

the

ago, during Pongal Head asked me if I gave the Overseer or the Dn office people any percentage on the Contracts that I get - I replied that I gave nothing - To which the Head Clerk said, oh all the Contractors say the same but I believe that the Dn office people get some-thing from you all - Please go & inform the Dn office Head Clerk that I have already spoken on the matter to him & I have also sent word through some other individuals & if he does not yield to my request & give a percentage he will get my displeasure - He also informed me that he gets percentage regularly from the other 4 Divisions - He told me I must bring him an answer soon. I immediately informed the Dl Head Clerk who told me that he would not interfere in the matter. I did not go again to the Superintending Engineers Head Clerk - I informed this to the Division Head Accountant also.

(Signed) S. Eyasawmy Pillay
14/3/81

(True copies)

323 1/2

H Opns No. 116 dd
30th May /81

Pl. 32/5

Bangalore
17th May 1881

Colonel R. H. Sankey C.B.
Royal Engineers
Ootacamund

Sir

I beg to be pardoned the liberty which I have in the present instance taken to bring the following circumstance to your notice, in the sincere hope that you will be so good as to bestow towards it a favorable consideration.

I beg to state, that the Bearer of this R. Cundasawmy Pillay late Head Clerk of the Executive Engineers Office, Trichinopoly Division, is as I am informed now dismissed from the Public Service without a just investigation into his case by the Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle, on the suspicion, and under the impression that he Cundasawmy Pillay had brought a false complaint against the

P.L. 32/5

№ 359

Trichinopoly Division Office
4th May 1881.

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Chief Engineer, P. W. D.
through the Supg. Engineer
3rd Circle, Trichinopoly.

Sir

I have the honor to forward in Original (to be returned) the judgement of the Superintending Engineer on the matter of a Complaint preferred by my Head Accountant and Head Clerk against the Supg. Engineer's Head Clerk and request you will be pleased to reverse the decision arrived at by the Supg. Engineer and restore the unfortunate men, he has thought fit to dismiss, to their posts.

2 It seems clear to me that the Supg. Engineer has taken but a one sided view of the case and has supported his Head Clerk, whose conduct in interfering with Contracts, he appears to have overlooked. It is obvious that a Supg. Engineer's Head Clerk should have nothing to do either directly or indirectly with Contracts.

3 I am decidedly of opinion also that Parancoodam

Naidoo did not come to me with the mere object of trying to get Mr Dudley on - I know Mr Dudley; he has often come to me and has expressed his wish of turning Contractor - I have invariably informed him (knowing him to be in pecuniary difficulties) that if he sent in his tenders which he never did & which I never expected him to do, with deposit money, I would give him every consideration - There was no special reason therefore for Paramcoodam Naidoo to take such a warm interest on his behalf - *The impression left on my mind and which I still believe was that Paramcoodam Naidoo came to me with the object of getting the Contract for himself in Mr Dudley's name* I cannot look upon the matter in any other light. His Conduct in this Case is open to the general suspicion (See Section 410 of the P.W. Code) and yet the Supg Engineer has actually supported him in the matter -

4 My proceedings in starting the Case were perfectly fair and straight-forward - I was asked to take and forward the depositions of but two individuals (the Supg Engineer forgets to mention this fact) which I did - I took the depositions of others for my own information & which I was not bound to forward - I do not know for certainty how the Supg. Engineer came to hear I had taken the depositions of others but he did come to hear of it, apparently through his Head Clerk who must have been told of it by Annasawmy Pillay or pensioned clerk Muthusawmy Pillay -

5 The enclosed correspondence regarding my office people will go to explain away paras 7 and 8 of the Supg Engineer's remarks on the Proceedings - It is usual when a delay occurs in reply to a reference, to call upon the Divisional officer for explanation; instead of doing so the Supg Engineer comes to the Conclusion that the delay must be with my Head Clerk and accordingly censures him - This sort of proceeding I naturally objected to - I am the best judge of my office men and I exonerate them from all blame and consider they (the Head Accountant and Head Clerk) have been very harshly treated by the Supg. Engineer -

6 It is not understood why when neither Government nor the Examiner (under whose direct Control my Head Accountant is) thought it necessary to threaten my Head Accountant with removal that the Supg Engineer should have done so in his No × 1223 F.C. of 14th December/80, the matter is altogether inexplicable to me - The state of the accounts although said to be on the whole unfavorable are not in such a hopeless state of Confusion as one would believe them to be on reading the Supg. Engineer's letter - My Head accountant has more work to do than any other accountant in the Circle - We retain Local Funds and the expenditure of the Division including Madura is about double that of any other Division in the Circle - yet it is only a Second class Division.

× marked C

No 359.

From,
The Offg Executive Engr
In chge of Trichy Dn

P.W. 3050/81
15

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Thro' the Supg Engr
3rd Circle

Dated 4th } May 1881
Received }

Enc – 6.

Judgement of the Supg Engineer 3rd Circle on the matter of a complaint preferred by Hd Accountant & Head Clerk of the Dn Office against the Supg Engineer's Head Clerk — Forwards in original the — & requests to reverse the decision arrived at by the Supg Engr & restore the unfortunate men &c.

No 211 T.C.

Supg Engrs Office 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly 16th May 1881

From,
Lieut Col J. Beatty R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

To,
Col R.H. Sankey C.B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Madras

Enclos-
1. Wrapper containing Enclosures to this letter from A to H.
1. Exe Engrs letter No 359 of 4th May /81 to the address of the Chief Engr with 6 Enclosures –

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith, by request of Mr Norfor, his appeal against a certain decision of mine, and in doing so I think it necessary to a clear understanding of the case to trouble you with a few remarks upon it and upon the statements in Mr Norfor's letter.

2. I was unable to forward the appeal at once, because I was absent from my head quarters when I received it, and a glance at the papers sent, showed me that Mr Norfor had omitted to

this man in the quarterly returns. Subsequently he again recommended Chokalingam for a certain post and stated that if Chokalingum× were appointed, Annaswami might be allowed to act for Santha Pillay in whose place Chokalingam had been acting.

× vide enclosure marked H

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedt. servant
L. Beatty. Lt Col. R.E
Supg. Engineer

Establishment

P.W.C.N. 3050

From,
The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D. -

No. 211 E.C.

Dated 16th May 1881
Recd 20 May.

Enclo: 60.

Memo: No. 116 d/ 30 May/81

Forwarding Appeal from Mr. Norfor — against a decision of the Supg. Engineer.

Sent to Coty 21-5-81.

P.W. 3050/81
16

Establishment
P.W.C. N. 3050

From,
The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 211 E.C.
Dated 16th May 1881
Recd 20 May.

Enclo: 60.

Memo: No. 116 d/30 May/81

Forwarding Appeal from Mr. Norfor — against a decision of the Supg. Engineer.

Sent to Coty 21-5-81.

2/5/81 CM

Proceedings of an enquiry held at Trichinopoly on the 7th April 1881, into a charge made by Head Clerk Cundaswami Pillay and Accountant Muthuswami Naidu, against Head Clerk Parancoosam Naidu.

The charge is contained in a letter dated 10th March 1881, addressed to the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, and runs as follows:—

2. "On several occasions the Head Clerk" (meaning Parancoosam Naidu the Head Clerk of the Superintending Engineer's office) "requested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Division."

3. The letter in question was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, by the Executive Engineer

Mr. C. A. L. Norfor, who stated that he believed in the truth of the charge.

4. It became therefore necessary for the Superintending Engineer to hold an Enquiry into the case; under para 748 of the P. W. Code.

5. In the presence of the accused person (Parancoosam Naidu) and of his accusers, the following evidence was taken:—

6. 1st Witness; Mr. Fonseca, Overseer in the Trichinopoly Taluq, mentioned in Mr. Norfor's letter forwarding the charge,

7. States that he has no evidence to give in regard to the charge.

8. Also states, with reference to the matter related in Mr. Norfor's letter, that Parancoosam Naidu came to him with Mr. Dudley, for the purpose of arranging that Mr. Dudley should enter into partnership with Chillambaram Pillay; but the latter refused to have Mr. Dudley as his partner.

[illegible] has nothing
to do with the charge under
enquiry, [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible]
[illegible] accused person
Parancoosam Naidu.

9. Also states that Parancoosam Naidu never urged him to recommend Mr. Dudley for contracts; and that, finding Mr. Dudley had no money, he enquired of Parancoosam Naidu why he interfered in Mr. Dudley's affairs; and Parancoosam Naidu replied that it was merely to please & Mr. Dudley; i.e., out of friendship.

& Mr Dudley having no money how was it to be expected that he could carry out the work? C.H.

The words under line are by me C.H.

10. Also that while Arunachellam Pillay was his writer in the Madura District, he (Arunachellam Pillay) made use of a document to which Mr. Fonseca's initials were forged.

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] charge.

Mr. Fonseca considers Arunachellam Pillay an untrustworthy person.

11. The 2nd witness, Srinivasa Pillay, third Clerk in the Superin=

=tending Engineer's Office, called at the request of Mr. Norfor, was next Examined:—

12. States that he has no know=ledge of the matter of the charge, except what he has been told by other parties.

13. Cross examined by Muthu=swami Naidu as to whether he did not, on several occasions, come to Muthuswami Naidu, and tell him that Parancoosam Naidu was angry because he did not settle his accounts; Srinivassa Pillay says he knows nothing about it.

14. Asked whether he did not, on several occasions, tell him that Parancoosam Naidu was trying to ruin him; Srinivassa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Cunda=swami Pillay.

16. Says he heard nothing about the per centage. But he

He was [illegible] Sec. 2 ½ Supt: Engr: Rev: 1566 J.C. V 2/3/01 CH

✻ Annaswami it will be observed in the [illegible] [illegible] examined, and he denies having ever told Srinivassa Pillay the [illegible]

✻ heard from Annaswami Pillay that Parancoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Accountant Muthuswami Naidu, also for Cundaswami Pillay's transfer on reduced pay; and that

No such arrangement was ever made, and [illegible] the Orders were not issued.

Orders would be passed in a week. Anna=swami Pillay also said that Parancoo=sam Naidu got Cun=daswami Pillay em=ployed in the Supg. Engineer's Office Madura, and promoted to his pre=sent post, and that notwithstand=ing this he had shown himself un=grateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthu=swami Pillay a pensioned Clerk

× Annaswami Pillay and Muthuswami Pillay have denied [illegible] Srinivassa Pillay their story.

17. Srinivassa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Paran=coosam Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay,

and does not recollect hearing anything about it from any other person.

18. When he heard from Muthuswami Pillay about the proposed transfers he heard nothing about the reduction of Cundaswami Pillay.

19. The 3rd witness C. M. Aroonachellum Pillay 3rd Grade Sub Overseer in the Trichinopoly Division was then called; and the evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor (vide Enclosure 3) was read to him and he adheres to it.

20. Says also that no one was present when Parancoosam Naidu told him to go and speak to Cundaswami Pillay and Muthuswami Naidu.

[illegible]

21. He remembers that Mr. Norfor recommended him for double travelling Allowance which was disallowed.

[illegible]

Sent to Offg 21-5-81.

22. He says he was not removed from under Mr. Fonseca for using a forged document, but at his own request. He says that the cause of ill-feeling between him and Mr. Fonseca was that he reported to Mr. O'Rahigan that Mr. Fonseca's Cash balance was short.

23. The 4th Witness, Ayaswami Pillay, a Contractor in the Trichinopoly Division, was then called.

24. The evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor (enclosure 4) was read to him and he adheres to it.

25. States that his conversation with Parancoosam Naidu took place in the Verandah of the Supg. Engineer's Office and that no other person was present. He is not a particular friend of Cundaswami Pillay or Muthuswami Naidu, and did not get a horse for Cundaswami Pillay.

[illegible]

hearsay - 4 witnesses know

26. The 5th Witness, Kistnaswami Pillay, 2nd Clerk in the Division office, was then called. The evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor was read to him. He adhered to it, and acknowledged his signature (vide Enclosure 5).

27. The 6th Witness, Armaswame Pillay, late acting Sub. Overseer was next called. His evidence given before Mr. Norfor (vide Enclosure 6) was read to him. He accepted it as correct and signed it.

28. Cross examined by Parancoosam Naidu. Says he never was spoken to by Parancoosam Naidu about Cundaswami Pillay or Muthuswami Naidu. The latter asked him to give evidence against Parancoosam Naidu; but did not say what evidence he was to give. Did not tell Srinivassa Pillay that Parancoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay.

Sent to

29. The 7th Witness, Muthuswami Pillay, a pensioned Clerk was then called, and his evidence (enclosure 7) was read to him and he accepts it as correct.

30. Says he is a friend of Parancoosam Naidu, and of Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay. Parancoosam Naidu never spoke to him about Muthuswami Naidu or Cundaswami Pillay. Did not tell Srinivassa Pillay about the proposed transfers as stated in Srinivassa Pillay's evidence.

31. The 8th Witness, Govindaswami Pillay, Draughtsman (Assistant) in the Division office was then called; his evidence before Mr. Norfor was read to him and he accepted it as correct.

32. Lastly, Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay were examined by Parancoosam Naidu.

33. Muthuswami Naidu said his

hearsay - 4 witnesses know

conversations with Parancoosam Naidu about collecting money for him took place when nobody was present.

34. Did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division Officer.

35. Never receives fees when he hands over cheques to Contractors.

36. Says Parancoosam Naidu asked him for fees on the ground that otherwise he would do him some harm.

37. That at the time of sending in the Annual Report on [illegible] # the Accountants, Parancoosam Naidu told him that the Supg. Engineer asked whether he (Parancoosam Naidu) was satisfied with Muthuswami Naidu, and that Parancoosam Naidu said he was satisfied.

Supdt. Engr. on the 19 Sept: Cy.

Sent to

38. He would not have made a written charge but that he was afraid of misrepresentations being made against him. Admits that Parancoosam Naidu by his representations can do nothing; but he represents himself as being able to do so.

39. Cundaswami Pillay, the Head Clerk of the Division Office was then called:—

40. States that there were no persons present when Parancoosam Naidu asked him to collect money.

41. Does not know how Parancoosam Naidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors and never delivers cheques to contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.

43. His brother in law is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His

hearsay - 4 witnesses

wife's Sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry -

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr. Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge
3. Deposition of Arunachellam Pillay
4. — Do — of Ayaswami Pillay
5. — Do — of Kistnaswami Pillay
6. — Do — of Annaswami Pillay
7. — Do — of Muthuswami Pillay
8. — Do — of Govindaswami Pillay
9. Mr. Norfor's Second letter.

C. Beatty Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd C

8th April/81.

P.h.3050/81
17

Sent No

General Remarks on the case, and the decision arrived at, by the Superintending Engineer.

1. The Supg Engineer has first to notice that the Offg Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, acted with great want of discretion in giving his countenance and support to such a charge as this; for by doing so he has simply led his subordinates on to their ruin - A very little common sense should have shown him that the evidence they had to give was of the most worthless character. But he seems to have been blinded by prejudice.

2. And his proceedings, when starting the case, were hardly fair and straightforward. In his first letter he states that he he has examined two witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4); and does not produce the depositions of the other four witnesses (Enclosures 5, 6, 7, 8) until these are specially called for by the Supg Engineer -

3. It is also observed that Mr. Norfor in December 1880, thought

hearsay - 4 witnesses

the charge against Parancoosam Naidu might be a "got up" complaint; but lately, for the reason given in para 2 of his letter apparently, he believes "there must be some truth in it". That reason is that Parancoosam Naidu endeavoured to get his friend Mr Dudley entrusted with the execution of some work on contract; and although Parancoosam Naidu did this openly, using only fair means, and failed to get his friend any work, Mr Norfor considers this a reason for believing that the charge against Parancoosam Naidu is true; ie, that he did attempt to extort fees or bribes.

The Supg Engineer, on the contrary, considers this to be, in fact, no reason at all.

4. As regards the specific charge against Parancoosam Naidu, the most definite statements are those made by his two accusers as given in their joint letter (Enclosure 2), and the depositions of their two principal witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4).

But as, in each case, the witnesses depose to something that happened when nobody else was present, the evidence is, in the opinion of the Supg Engineer, perfectly worthless, and such as would not be accepted in any court of law.

5. The brazen-faced confession of the principal witness (para 22 of the Proceedings), that he had once acted the part of informer against his immediate superior, is enough to stamp the character of the man. He seems to have brought a false charge on that occasion too.#

I believe the charge was not false, I have seen the correspondence but some time ago. Cd.

6. Again the charge is that, on several occasions, Parancoosam Naidu asked Kundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu to collect for him 3 per cent on all contracts; and their witness Ayasami Pillay further states that this percentage is paid to Parancoosam Naidu by all other Divisions. But when Kundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu are asked to explain how the collection was to be made, they declare they have not

Really - 4 witnesses Kn

the least idea. Now either the charge is false, as the Supg Engr fully believes; or these men were lying when they said they did not know how the collection was to be made. In either case they are untrustworthy and unfit for the Government service.

7. Then as to their reason for bringing the charge; viz, lest he should do them some harm; ie, by misrepresentations to the Supg Engineer: they are unable to adduce a single instance in which a member of the Office Establishments has been unfairly dealt with.

8. Cundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu are also well aware that what they call the "unbearable threats & warnings" of the Supg Engineer were well deserved, and were in reality nothing more than his reasonable complaints at the excessive and most vexatious delays — (such delays as very rarely happen in any other Division) that have repeatedly occurred in the Trichinopoly Division, in furnishing information called for, or replies to references. They know well that they alone, by their inefficiency or negligence, are responsible for these complaints; and that this is a mere excuse, of no value whatever, craftily introduced to hide their real motives. The origin of the whole business was, no doubt, feelings of malice and jealousy totally unconnected with anything in Purancoosam Naidu's discharge of his duties as Head Clerk.

9. As regards the rest of the evidence recorded, the Supg Engr cannot see that it in any way supports the principal charge, that of attempting to extort fees by threats; and he has good reason to believe from enquiries since made that Cundasami Pillay's Statement (para 43 of the Proceedings) that his brotherinlaw is not a Contractor in the Division is false. The person in question is named Annasami Pillay, and this man's sister is Cundasami Pillay's wife. Two respectable witnesses state that Annasami Pillay was lately a Contractor, if not just now.

by Kistnasami, but is only hearsay - 4 witnesses know

10. On the other hand the accused possesses first-rate testimonials from the following officers:—

Colonels Wilkieson, Lawford, Roberts, and Sankey;

Lieut. Col. H. L. Prendergast;

Major G. M. Payne;

and Messrs. R. C. Dobbs, J. O. Grant, W. Hughes, J. W. Martin, and J. W. Rundall. at the last reorganization, Mr. Rundall specially selected Parancoosam Naidu for his present post in preference to others of longer service.

11. The Supg. Engr. considers that Cundasamy Pillay and Muthusami Naidu have totally failed to substantiate the very serious charge they brought against a man of the highest character. The charge of course was brought for the purpose, and apparently in expectation, of ruining Parancoosam Naidu. If it had been proved, he must have been dismissed. But the charge has not been substantiated and the Supg. Engineer believes it to be false. He has no doubt that the four persons, Cundasami Pillay, Muthusami Naidu, Arunáchellam Pillay, and Ayasami have been guilty of a malicious conspiracy to ruin Parancoosam Naidu.

12. Such being the case it becomes necessary to decide what punishment is most suitable in the case of Conspirators, such as these men have proved themselves to be, so as to deter others like them from engaging in similar attempts to blacken the character of members of the Department in this Circle.

13. The Supg. Engineer considers it his duty to himself, as well as to all his subordinates, to inflict the severest punishment in his power.

Head Clerk, Cundasami Pillai and Sub Overseer Arunáchellam Pillay will be dismissed from the public service.

Accountant Muthusami Naidu will be recommended to the Examiner for dismissal.

Contractor Ayasami Pillay will not be allowed again to enter into contracts in this Circle.

L. Beatty Lieut. Col. R.E.

28th April 1881 Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

1

P.W. 3080/81
16

Memo

On the case reported to Gov
with S.E. 3rd Circle No. 152 T.C. dat
2nd May 1881

Accusers-
Muthusami Naidu
Acct. Trichy Do.
Cundasami- Head
Clerk E.E.'s Office
Trichy Do.

Accused
Parancoosami Naidu
Head Clerk S.E.'s Office
3rd Do.

The accusations are:-

1- Prompting to collect the
percent on all payment
made to Contractors-

2- Ill-feeling by Accuse
towards Accusers.

3- Threats to intimi
Accusers-

Eight persons were examin
of whom all except Fonsec
are named in Accusers
letter as able to speak
to the accusations-

Accusation 1- is confirm
by 2 witnesses, Arunachall
Sub Overseer and Ayasam
Contractor: 4 witnesses*
know nothing about it; an
the remaining 2° were no
apparently asked about it.

*Amasami
Muthusami Pillay
Fonseca
Srinivasa Pillay

°Kistnasami
Govindsami

Accusation 2- is spoken
by Kistnasami, but is only
hearsay- 4 witnesses kno

P.W. 3080/81
76

Memo

On the case reported to Gove
with S.E. 3rd Circle No 152 T.C date
2nd May 1881

Accusers

Muthusami Naidu
Acct Trichy Dn
Cundusami – Head
Clerk E. E's Office
Trichy Dn

Accused

Paramasivam Naidu
Head Clerk S. E's Office
3rd Dn

The accusations ~~are~~ :–

1 – Prompting to collect three
percent on all payments
made to Contractors –

2 – Ill-feeling by Accuse
towards Accusers.

3 – Threats to intimidate
accusers –

Eight persons were examin
of whom all except Fonseca
are named in Accusers'
letter as able to speak
to the accusations –

Accusation 1 – is confirm
by 2 witnesses, Arunachella
Sub Overseer and Ayasami
Contractor: 4 witnesses*
know nothing about it; and
the remaining 2 were not
apparently asked about it.

*Amasami
Muthusami Pillay
Fonseca
Srinivasa Pillay
o Kistnasami
Govindsami

Accusation 2 – is spoken to
by Kistnasami, but is only
hearsay – 4 witnesses know

Sent to Ooty 21-5-81

nothing about any illfeeling: 3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it—

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Govindsamie 2nd Offr. S.S.'s office, & Srinivasa Pillay 3rd Cl. S.S.'s office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denies all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point—

W. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the S.S.'s remark that Paramasivam "had been to W. Fonseca"— This witness's allegations against Arunachelam, and the latter's counter-allegations against W. Fonseca can be worth little— for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt. employ!

The *confirmatory* evidence is as follows—

2 witnesses— in regard *to accusation* 1

1 witness— (in a measure) in regard *to accusation* 2—

2 witnesses— in regard to *accusation* 3

Only one witness *denies* point blank— & that is in regard to accusation 3—

In other cases, the witnesses say they *know nothing*; or else they were *not* *asked*—

As to the confirmatory evidence— Stress is laid by the S.S. on the fact of its being unsubstantiated, the alleged conversation having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties. (This with reference to accusations.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be nothing about any ill-feeling: 3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it –

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Covindsamie 2nd Offr. S.S.'s office, & Srinivasa Pillay, 3rd Cl. S.S.'s office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denies all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point –

W. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the S.S.'s remark that Paramasamie "had been to W. Fonseca" – This witness's allegations against Arunachelam, and the latter's counter-allegations against W. Fonseca can be worth little – for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt. employ!

The confirmatory evidence is as follows –

2 witnesses – in regard to Accusation 1

1 witness – (in a measure) in regard to Accusation 2 –

2 witnesses – in regard to accusation 3

Only one witness denies point blank – & that is in regard to accusation 3 –

In other cases, the witnesses say they know nothing; or else they were not asked –

As to the confirmatory evidence. Stress is laid by the S.S. on the fact of its being unsubstantiated, the alleged conversation having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties. (This with reference to Accusation 1.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be nothing about any ill-feeling: 3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it–

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Govindsami 2nd Offr. S.S.'s office, & Srinivasa Pillay, 3rd Cl. S.S.'s office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denies all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point–

W. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the S.S.'s reason that Paramaswami "had been to W. Fonseca"– This witness's allegations against Arunachelam, and the latter's counter-allegations against W. Fonseca can be worth little– for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt. employ!

The *confirmatory* evidence is as follows–

2 witnesses– in regard to *accusation 1*

1 witness– (in a measure) in regard to *Accusation 2*–

2 witnesses– in regard to *accusation 3*

Only one witness *denies* point blank– & that is in regard to accusation 3–

In other cases, the witnesses say they *know nothing*; or else they were *not* *asked*–

As to the confirmatory evidence– Stress is laid by the S.S. on the fact of its being unsubstantiated, the alleged conversation having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties. (This with reference to accusation 1.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be no bribery. The witnesses were not to blame in the affair, so it was not their interest to prevent bribery.

[illegible]

As to accusation 2 - the hearsay evidence is not worth much & is not confirmed by others & appears to have been relied on by the accused to show motive & animus -

As to accusation 3, it is confirmed by two witnesses & no counterevidence is adduced to disprove it -

So far then the weight of the evidence is in favor of the accusers - the only distinct denial being that of one witness in regard to the minor accusation of threatened transfer of the accusers -

The S.E. has summed up the evidence & has given his opinion on the case - but has not always adhered only to the facts brought out in evidence, vide his paras 7, end of para 8, & end of para 9 -

His argument in para 6 is illogical - Had the accusers explained how the collections were to be made, they would simply have committed themselves, & the argument might then have been that they had evidently entertained the proposition, & planned its execution, in contradiction of their written statement that "we will never interfere in the matter & that if he wishes he may collect the required percentage himself from the contractors"

The "annual report" referred to at para 37 of the notes of the enquiry, is the Report of the E.E. on the Divisional Accountant - This is forwarded to Examiner countersigned by the S.E.

The result of the enquiry is ~~that~~ the S.E. has dismissed Candasamie his Head clerk and Arunachellam Sub Overseer - & has debarred Agasamie Contractor from employment in the 3rd Circle of Superintendence. With these orders I have no right to interfere - He has recommended the accountant for dismissal - In this I cannot concur - In my opinion, tho' the accusations have not been proved, the weight of evidence is not in favor of the accused - the nature of the main accusation is scarcely capable of substantiation - There is however enough brought out to show that there was an undercurrent of scheming & irregularity, & that the accountant could have stopped all this by confronting his informers, Arunachellam and Ayasami, with the Ex Engr at the first hint

from them of the alleged proposal - He preferred to make a verbal report & to leave matters to take their course for a further period -

I consider his case will be met by reduction to the minimum of his grade & his transfer at his own expense to my Office -

As to the Head Clerk of the S.E's Office, I submit that he should be transferred to another circle - The S.E. acquits him entirely & further gives him an eulogistic certificate - He has been in the Office since November 78 - & has been contemporary with his accusers since May 77 Oct & Decr 79 -

5th May 81 Examiner

No. 1223 T.C

Supdg. Engrs. Office, 3rd Circle
Camp Palandorai Anicut
14th December 1880
Despd. 18th

From
The Supdg. Engineer
3rd Circle

C.1

To
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir

In forwarding the accompanying copy of G.O. No. 2689 W of the 23rd November 1880, I have the honor to point out that it is very discreditable to your Head Accountant Muthusamy Naidu as regards the state of the Accounts in your Division. It is considered of much importance that the work registers should be maintained as correctly & as carefully as possible, & any neglect of this important work is decidedly unsatisfactory.

Enclo-1

Please insist upon your Head Accountant attending to the Circulars & instructions of the Examiner as minutely as possible, & have the accounts prepared in a systematic manner, & should he not exert himself to remedy the present disorderly state of things in the Account branch I will be compelled to request

---

preference to those who are young and efficient. x

(Signed) J. V. Beatty Lieutt. Coll. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
(True copy)

Offg. Exe. Engr. Trichy. Dn.

P.W. 3050/81
56

x Chockalingum is not an old man – Vythinatha Iyer is not efficient as he is too inexperienced, & was never before employed as a Sub Overseer

C.A.

No. 1258 T.C

Supg. Engrs. Office, 3rd Circle
Shatiatope, 23rd Decr. 1880
Despd. 25th

Memo

With reference to his letter No. 3030 of the 16th Instant, the undersigned has the honor to inform Mr. Horsfor that, although Mr. Vincent's stay at Madura was short, Mr. J. Hutchings was for a long time in Madura, & his opinion of Chokolingum pillay is quite sufficient to bar x his claim for a permanent appointment. In fact he would not have been appointed if the undersigned had been aware of his antecedents in the first instance.

x until he has had at least one year's approved Service under another Officer

2 Although the words referred to by Mr. Horsfor, viz., "who possess good testimonials," are not in any of the Government orders, the undersigned would remind Mr. Horsfor that it should be the duty of every Officer of Government to select such men in filling up vacancies. It does not necessarily follow that because a man is thrown out by reduction he must be provided for, even without good testimonials, in

---

only a month; & from his remark it would appear that the Sub Overseer's ill health was the cause of his being of little use.

2 Will you please communicate to me the No. & date of the order, in which the words underlined by you in para 2 of your letter, "who possess good testimonials", are printed, as the G. O. I have quoted contains no reservations of any kind. I need hardly mention that the Examiner will take exception to Vythinatha Iyer's appointment so long as a thrown out man is available for the post.

P. W. 3050/81
57

I have &c.
(Signed) C. A. J. Horsfor
Offg. Exe. Engr. Trichy Dn.

(True Copy)

Offg. Exe. Engr. Trichy Dn.

Trichinopoly Division Office
No. 3030
16th December 1880
Despd. 17th

From
The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

With reference to your No. 1203 &c dated 9th Instant (para 3), I have the honor to inform you that I have not a very *high opinion* of Sub Overseer Chokolingum pillay as you seem to think I have — I recommend him for the vacant post on the strength of G.O. No. 2341 W. dated 11th October 1880; and as I had heard nothing against his qualifications since his employment in this Division from September last, I have also seen him, & have not formed an unfavorable opinion of him — From the copy of remarks forwarded it is understood that Chokolingum pillay was not well spoken of by Mr Hutchings; Mr Vincent's stay in Madura was for

---

5 Mr Norfor is requested to report on Vythinatha Iyer after a three months trial

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieutt. Coll. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

(True Copy)

Offg. Exe. Engr. Trich. Dn.

P.W. 3050/81
5-8

No. 2839

Trichinopoly Dn. Office
29th November 1880
Despd. 30th

F

A

From
The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

Your No. 1131 T.C. dated 23rd November 1880

I have the honor to inform you that G. Vythinatha Iyer, appointed 3rd grade Sub Overseer, reported his arrival on the afternoon of the 26th Instant.

I beg to point out ~~here~~ that Vythinatha Iyer is not a thrown out employee; & his appointment is contrary to the orders of Govt. No. 2341W dated 11th October 1880, in which it is clearly stated that Subordinates, removed by reduction, must invariably be re-entertained in preference to persons not hitherto in Govt. employ.

Chokalingum Pillay, whom I have recommended in my letter No. 2198 dated 2nd October last for the appointment in question, is a man thrown out of employment in the recent reduction of Establishment, & to whom a compensation gratuity of Rs. 40 is sanctioned in G.O. No. 1002/8-10-80 (Pension Department).

P.W. 3050/81
50

This file shows that references have not been referred to in it. My Office people are also blamed.

CH

A.

No. 1566 T.C.

Trichinopoly
2d. March 1881

From,

The Superintending Engineer
3d. Circle

To,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

No. 508
23-2-81

To be returned -

In forwarding the enclosed letter from the Collector, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to furnish me with the information called for in this Office No. 1277 T.C of the 27th. December/80 as early as practicable to enable me to reply to the Collector's letter at once. -

2 - It is not understood why this information which was called for 2 months ago, has not yet been furnished. - Please submit the reply at once, and explain in full the cause of the delay & who is responsible for this state of things in the Trichinopoly Division which is most disgraceful to it, and no such delays occur in any other office. Some reply should be given at once. It seems to me that it be necessary to remove both the Head Clerk & the Accountant -

I have &c.
(Signed) L. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
(Supdg. Engr. 3d. Circle)

(True Copy)

C. Clifton
Offg. Ex: Engineer Trichy. Dn.
Offg. Exe Engineer.

P.L. 3050/81
555

Executive Engineer's Office
8th March /81.

No. 614

From,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,
The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Your No. 1566 T.C of 2-3-81

Encls 13

1 Collectors letter No. 4105/23-12-80
1 — Do — Do — 508/23-2-81
1 — Do — Do — 4451/9-12-79
with its
9 Enclosures.
1 Late Madura Dn. Offr's letter No. 2888/18-12-79 to the late Dindigul Sub Dn. Offr.
13

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith all the papers relating to the claim of one Narayana Iyengar for extension of Nunjah Cultivation under an anicut across the Kodavanaur river in the Dindigul Taluq received this day from the Madura Sub Divisional Officer.—

2— The late Dindigul Sub Dn. Officer to whom the papers were forwarded for personal inspection of the spot & report appears not to have done any thing in the matter.—

3— The delay in replying to this reference is due to the searching of the documents among the old records both in this & Madura Sub Dn. Offices. The records are in a very confused state & the Registers (Receipt & Despatch) of the late Madura Division Office are not correctly maintained. References are, in consequence, not easily traceable. Please therefore authorize me to send in an approximate Estimate for the cost of an Establt.

Trichy. Dn.

Offg. Exe Engineer.

Establishment for bringing these records into some order — In conclusion I beg to state that I am the best judge as to whether my Head Clerk and Accountant should be removed — and I am not prepared to recom=mend the removal of either —

I have &c &c

Signed/ C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Ex: Engineer Trichy Dn

/True Copy/

Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

P. W. 305/54

No. 1613 T.C
12-3-81-

Memo

With reference to the 3rd para of letter from the Trichinopoly Division Officer No. 614 of 8th March 1881, the undersigned has the honor to observe that the Divisional officer was some months since called upon for an Estimate of the cost of sorting all the records of the Division including the Madura Sub Division records and the Establishment he then applied for was sanctioned — A special report is there=fore now necessary to accompany the pro=posed supplemental Estimate, explaining how it has happened that the original Esti=mate has proved insufficient —

2 — In regard to the ability of the Head Clerk & Accountant of the Trichinopoly Division to carry out the duties of their present posts, the undersigned can only judge of it by the work done which is at present any thing but satisfactory whether as regards answers to references, or submission of accounts; but he is willing to await further experience before urging their removal —

Signed/ J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engr. 3rd Circle

/True Copy/

Offg Executive Engr Trichy Dn

P. W 3050/81
53

Executive Engineer's Office
16 March 1881–

No. 4179.

From,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,
The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly–

Sir

In acknowledging the receipt of your memo No. 1613 T.C. dated 12th instant, I have the honor to invite your attention to this Office No. 1248 dated 15th July last where you will observe that the Establishment asked for was for sorting the records of this District only – The Madura records were not received in this Office until August last so that it was impossible to say at the time the Estimate was sent in what state the Madura records were in – I request you will now apply for 2 clerks on 15 Rs a month each for 2 months for sorting the Madura Records–

2– I have already Explained to you that my Hd. Accountant & Hd. Clerk have been blamed for delays which they are in no way responsible for – and I ~~report~~ repeat that I am the best judge as to how they perform their duties – it is also not right to set aside the opinion I have formed of the men directly under my orders–

+ Set

3– As regards my Hd. Accountant, it is true that his accounts have been late but as matter of

Offg. Exe Engineer

of that they have been late in every Division in your Circle - The accounts of this Division have been sent in more punctually than Tanjore and Tinnevelly and in fairness to my Hd. Accountant, therefore I trust that you have thought it necessary to contemplate the removal of these Divisions' Accountants also and have so informed them -

4- I would draw your attention to this Office No. 3235 dated 4th January last and to letter No. 3833 dated 17th February last to the Examiner P.W. Accounts - Copy of which was sent to you with this Office No. 3934 of 26-2-81 and beg that my opinions & suggestions be treated with some respect -

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg. Ex: Engineer Trichy. Dn.

(True Copy)

Offg. Ex: Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

P. W. 3050/
52

Reply from the Superintending Engineer to the Division Officer's letter No. 4179 of 16-3-81-

Memo

No. 1680 T.C
22-3-81

The undersigned has the honor to request copy of his No. 1248 of 15th July 1880 - The Madura Sub Division was then part of the Trichinopoly Division and Explanation is still needed as to why an incomplete Estimate was then submitted -

All the accountants of Divisions are being treated exactly alike -

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3d Circle -

(True Copy)

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

Offg. Exe Engineer.

P.L. 3050/81
51

Executive Engineer's Office
29th March 1881-

No. 4333-

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

To
The Superintending Engineer 3rd C.
Trichinopoly-

Encls - 2-

Sir

In returning herewith your Endorsement No. 1680 S.C. dated 22nd instant I have the honor to forward the enclosed Copy of this Office letter No. 1248 dated 15th July last to your address I have already explained why the Estimate did not include the sorting of the Madura Records - See para 1 of my letter No. 4179 dated 16th instant - They were not here when the Estimate was sent in by Mr. Manson & it was therefore not known in what order they were in -

The destruction of the old & useless records of the Madura Division was authorized by your Office No. 110 M.D. dated 15th May/80 - The Establishment now wanted is not for destroying old records, but

Offg. Exe Engineer.

but for putting those that have been retained + in proper order—

+ units

I have &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Morfor
Offg. Ex: Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

(True Copy)

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

No. 1248

Executive Engineer's Office
15th July 1880.

From.
The Assistant Engineer
In Charge Trichinopoly Dn.

To
The Superintending Engineer
3d. Circle

Sir;

With reference to your Endorsement No. 789. T. J. dated 6th Instant on G. O. No. 1433 Ms dated 18th Ultimo I have the honor to inform you that the services of two clerks each on Rs 15 per mensem for the period of two months are required in order to arrange the records of this District to enable me to determine what records can be destroyed. The several Taluks have been formed into Ranges and Sub Divisions in "by permutations and Combinations" and the result has been that none but the most recent records are in any order at all suitable for present reference.

I have &c.

(Signed) G. E. Manson
Asst Engineer

(True copy)

Offg. Exe Engineer.

P W 3050/81
50

This file shows that references have not been referred to in it. My office people are also blamed.

CH

A.

in the year if I then required them. I replied by No 4031 of 5/3/81 that Rs 3,000 was still required on River Embankments. I did not in this letter urge the money required for Irrigation Repairs.

P W 3050/81
46

Mr Morrison assures me that he will be able to spend all the money now allotted, so that no surrender will be necessary.

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C. A. T. Morford
Offg Executive Engr
In chge of Trichy Dn

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engineer
In chge of Trichy Dn

P/No 3050/81
50

This file shows that references have not been referred to in it. my Office people are also blamed.

CH

A.

No 4336

No 3393
15/1/81
Despd 16/Do

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In chge of Trichy Dn

To, The Superintg Engineer
3rd Circle.
Trichinopoly

X

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to apply to Govt for a further grant of Rs 3000 to meet the cost of certain emergent Estimates for River embankment which are under preparation, also a further allotment of Rs 2000 on Irrigation Repairs will be required.

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C.H.J. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr

(True copy)

C.H.
Offg Executive Engr
In chge of Trichy Dn

P.W. 3050/81
49

No 4220
20/3/81
Despd 21/do

From,
The Offg Executive Engineer
In chge of Trichy Dn

To,
The Superintg Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you, with reference to your No 1638. T.C. dated 17th instant ~~that~~ the allotment on River embankment is Rs 1544 more than required - Mr Monson however has been directed to report if he will be able to utilize this extra amount before the end of the year.

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Norford
Offg Executive Engr
In chge of Trichy Dn

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engr
In chge of Trichy Dn

Pl. 3050/81
48

No. 1693 T.C. Superintending Engineer's Office 3rd Ci
Trichinopoly 25th March 1881

From

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

In continuation of this office No. 1638 T.C. of the 17th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that Government in their order No. 191 I of the 15th idem approved of the Recommendation of the Chief Engineer and to request that you will be good enough to add the sum of Rs 1000 and 4544 under Irrigation and Navigation works &c. Repairs and Agricultural works Repairs River Embankments respectively in your Accounts of the Current year.

2. With reference to your No. 4220 of the 20th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that in your Statement which accompanied your No. 3832 of the 17th February/81 you applied for a sum of Rs 11468 under Repairs River

Embankment which was included in the General Statement forwarded from this office but Government have allotted to your Division only Rs 4544 and as you now state that Rs 1544 are more than what you require for the Current year and that you have directed Mr Manson to report if he will be able to utilize this extra sum before the end of the Current year I request you will be good enough to hasten your reply at an early date so that I may be able to surrender the Amount to Government in time

I have &c

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieut Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly

P.h 3050/81
47

No 4336
29. 3. 81

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In Chge of Trichy Dn

To, The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

3050/81
45

Sir,

With reference to your letter No
1693. S.C. dated 25th Instant I have the
honor to inform you that the statement
which accompanied my No 3832 of the
17th February last merely showed the
probable cost on different heads of repairing
the damages done to Irrigation & other
works by the late storm & this information
was called for by you in your No 2257 S.J.
of 10th February /81- In submitting the
statement I applied for no money for
the current year- I stated merely the
amounts that would be spent in this
official year (see my letter No 3832 of
17/2/81 again) I had at the time a large
surplus unspent on River embankments-

In my letter No 3393 of 15/1/81 I applied
for Rs 2000 on Irrigation Repairs and
Rs 3000 on River Embankments- The Chief
Engineer replied saying that he would
place funds at my disposal later on
in

in the year, if I then required them. I replied by No 4031 of 5/3/81 that Rs 3,000 was still required on River Embankments. I did not in this letter urge the money required for Irrigation Repairs.

Mr Morrison assures me that he will be able to spend all the money now allotted, so that no surrender will be necessary.

P.W. 3050/81
46

I have the honor &c

(Signed) C. A. T. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr
In Chge of Trichy Dn

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engineer
In Chge of Trichy Dn

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1475 F.C dated 11th instt, I have the honor to inform you that the Irrigation Chief Engineer in his Memorandum No III/2 F.C dated 25th ultimo, communicated with your endorsement No 1471 F.C/10-2-81 has ruled that this Department should attend to Imperial Irrigation works only.

P.W. 3050/81
45

The Padugai Channel referred to, in your letter under reference is not an Imperial work.

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. A. T. Norfor
Offg. Ex. Engineer.

(True Copies)

4th May/81.

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Trichinopoly Division who is requested to submit an Estimate for repairing the Padugai Channel, which is evidently not such an insignificant channel as he represented it to be & some explanation is needed as to how he came to make the report noted -

21-1-81.

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer.

From No 3570/29-1-81

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

In returning your endorsement No 1384 F.C. dated 21st January 81. I have the honor to remark that I have no explanation to offer. I did not describe the channel as an insignificant one nor do I see any thing in my letter to lead you to believe that it was a petty channel. You had moreover the Overseer's Report before you on the channel for guidance. I objected to clear it out on the ground that it was a branch channel not a petty branch channel and I based my objection on a Board of Revenue standing order. This standing order refered to branch channels irrespective of size or importance. You evidently had not the complete file on this subject before you or you would not have blamed me in the matter.

I have &c &c

29-1-81

(Signed) C. H. F. Norfor
Offg. Ex. Engineer

Supg. Engineer's office 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly 11th February/81.

No 1475 F.C.

From

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

x Your No 3570 of 29th ultimo.

Sir

I have the honor to observe that you are quite correct in stating that you had not described the channel as an unimportant one. That was merely the erroneous impression I gathered from the correspondence.

2. I am however decidedly of opinion that any branch channel that irrigates in more than one village should be repaired by this Department, and that the rules of the Board of Revenue were not intended to be applied to such channels.

3. I have therefore the honor to request you will be good enough to have the Estimate for Padugai channel prepared & the work carried out by this Department as early as practicable.

I have &c &c

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

Executive Engineer's office
18th Feby/81.

No 3852 of 18/2/81

From

The Executive Engr. Trichinopoly Div.

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1475 I.C dated 11th instt., I have the honor to inform you that the Irrigation Chief Engineer in his memorandum No $\frac{\text{III}}{\text{2 I.C}}$ dated 25th ultimo, communicated with your endorsement No $\frac{\text{1471 I.C}}{\text{10-2-81}}$ has ruled that this Department should attend to Imperial Irrigation works only.

The Padugai Channel referred to, in your letter under reference is not an Imperial work.

I have &c &c
(Signed) C. A. F. Norfor
Offg. Ex. Engineer.

(True Copies)

4th May/81.

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

P.L 3050/81
45

P.L 3050/81
37

A.

Trichinopoly
No. 159 26th January 1881.

From.
The Officer Commanding
Trichinopoly.

To
The Supg Engineer
Trichinopoly

Has the honor to request that a Competent Subordinate of his Department may be directed to inspect the armourers' shop of the 30th Regiment M.I.

The archway inside of this building has Completely Collapsed and in the opinion of the undersigned the building is in a very dangerous Condition.

Requests the favor of this being attended to at once.

(Signed) C. George Col
Commanding Trichinopoly

No. 1412 T.C.

Forwarded to the Executive Engr. Trichinopoly Division who is requested to take immediate steps for inspecting the building and for submitting an Estimate for putting in thorough repair. Any* work emergently required may be carried out in anticipation of Sanction.

*: repairs are not here specially alluded to. CH.

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle
29-1-81

(True Copy)

Offg Executive Engineer

4- In regard to the 4th para of

Pl. 3050/81
44

Encl. 3

No. 4027

Executive Engineer's Office
5th March 1881.

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division
To
The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle.

Sir,

In returning your Endorsement No. 1412 T.C of the 29th January last, I have the honor to submit for sanction and appropriation of funds the accompanying Estimate — amounting to Rs 310 for repairing the armourer's Shop 30th Regiment Trichinopoly

2. The portion of the building which was said to be in a dangerous state has been pulled down and the work is being done in accordance with the plan and Estimate herewith forwarded.

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Exe Engineer

True Copy

Offg Exe Engineer.

P.W. 3050/81
43

No. 1673 T.C.

Supg Engrs Office 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly 22nd March 1881.

From,
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

Enclosures 4.
To be returned
1- Letter No. 403
1- G.O. No. 2520/4-9-75
1- Estimate
1- Plan.

In forwarding the accompanying papers regarding armourer's shop, the undersigned has the honor to request that he will be good enough to furnish this Office with the information required by the Station Staff Officer, at his earliest Convenience as to the probable Cost of Constructing a new building on the Standard plan

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engr 3rd Circle

(True Copy)

Offg. Exec Engineer

Executive Engineer's Office
29th March 1881.

No. 4339.

From. The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle

Ph 3050/81
42

Sir,

With reference to your No. 1673 T.C of the 22nd Instant, I have the honor to state that the Construction of a new Armourer's shop in accordance with the Standard Design would probably Cost Rs 2000 - In para 2 of my No. 4027/5-3-81 it is reported that the work is being done in accordance with the plan and Estimate therewith forwarded -

Enclo 4.

1 - Estimate
1 - Plan
1 - Letter No. 403/17-3-81
1 - G.O. No. 2520/4-9-75
with standard Plan.

I have &c.
(Signed) C. H. T. Monfor
Offg. Exec: Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

(True Copy)

C. Mufor
Offg Exec Engineer.

P.W. 3050/41

No 67.C.

Supg Engineer's Office 3rd Circle
Madura 2nd April 1881.

[illegible]

From.
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir

With reference to your letter No 4339 of 29th March 1881, I have the honor to point out that no work should be commenced without the consent of the Military authorities and there is nothing in the papers received from you to show that their consent has been obtained

2. It is true that I authorised you to carry out any emergent work, but it would have been well if you had let the Military authorities know what this Department was doing on their requisition.

I have &c.

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieut Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

(True copy)

Offg Exe Engineer

Ph. 3050/81
40

No. 58

Executive Engineer's Office
9th April 1881.

From.
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 67.C dated 2nd Instant I most respectfully beg of you kindly to refer to complete files before writing to me.

You state that no work should be commenced without the consent of the military authorities.

The Officer Commanding Trichinopoly in his No. 159 of 20th January/81 reported that the building was in a very dangerous state and requested that it be attended to at once. What occasion therefore was there for my obtaining their consent to do the work which they particularly wished carried out?

Moreover I informed you so far back as the 5th March last that I had commenced the work and you then did not think it necessary to ask me if I ~~Consulted~~ Consulted

Consulted
~~Consented~~ the Military authorities before putting the work in hand.

With reference to para 2 of your letter I beg to state that it has not hitherto been usual to let the Military authorities know that their urgent requisitions are being complied with.

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Norton
Offg Exec Engineer

(True Copy)

Offg Exec Engineer

P.W. 3050/81
39

No. 58
9-4-81

No. 121 T.C.

Memo.

With reference to the letter of the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, the first paragraph of which was not written in a very becoming spirit, the undersigned has the honor to state that in his opinion no new work or radical alteration of an old one should ever be commenced without or in anticipation of special sanction.

2. In this particular case the work consisted apparently of alterations and improvements of a wash house for the purpose of converting it into an armourer's shop, and the Military authorities now request that the matter may be allowed to stand over until a certain decision of Government is given.

it certainly did not. CH

3. Ordinary repairs if called for by the Military authorities in writing and in the requisition declared to be emergent, may of course be proceeded with in anticipation of sanction; but new works, or alterations and improvements, are on a totally different footing, and the Supg Engineer is astonished that any Division Officer should treat them alike.

4. In regard to the 4th para of

of Mr Norfor's letter, the Supg. Engineer naturally assumed that the Divisional Officer was acting with the full knowledge and Concurrance of the Military authorities which it now seems he was not.

5- In reference to para 5 of the letter under reference the Supg Engineer regrets to learn that there has hitherto been such serious laxity on the part of the Division Office, and he trusts Mr Norfor will put a stop to it at once.

6- If the alterations and improvements in question which it appears now may never be sanctioned, and should not have been commenced, in anticipation of sanction, are in progress, they should be stopped forthwith -

P.W. 3050/81
38

Cuddalore }
24th April/81 }

(Sd) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engr 3rd Circle

(True Copy)

Offg Exe Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly Dn.

No 308
30-4-81

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In Chge of Trichy Dn

To, The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

050/81
32

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your memo No 121. S.C. / 24-4-81 I regret exceedingly that you should still consider me to blame for carrying out your orders and trust that this will be the last occasion I shall have to write on the subject of the armourers' workshop.

2. The Estimate does not provide for radical alterations or improvements but merely for pulling down & rebuilding dangerous portions of the building on the original design. The building would require very extensive improvements to convert it into an Armourers' Shop. It is clearly a repair Estimate and cannot be called any thing else.

3. I do not agree with para 3 of your memo under notice; If I get an urgent requisition from the Military authorities either orally or in writing to execute either repairs or improvements to military

Buildings I am expected to at once comply with their requisition, see paras 315 & 1139 of the P.W. Code - I am aware that I cannot of my own accord sanction an estimate for improvements to military Buildings, but I am directed to carry out any work at once considered urgent by ~~the~~ officer Commanding the Station -

4. I consider ~~that~~ it was your duty ~~to~~ have informed the Commanding officer ~~that~~ you had directed me to carry out any emergent work required, and, as ~~the~~ correspondence was between you two, to have also informed him that I was complying with his request immediately you became aware of the fact.

5. I deny any serious laxity on the part of my office -

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C. A. F. Norford
Offg Executive Engr

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engr
[illegible]

2

Ph 3050/87
37

A.

A.

P.h. 3050/8
32

P.W 3050/81
37

A.

No. 1238 T.C.

Superintending Engineer's Office
Camp Shatiatope 20th December/80
Despd. 23d — Do —

From

The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle –

To,

The Executive Engineer,
Trichinopoly –

Sir

Enclosure 1

In forwarding the enclosed letter for your perusal and return, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to instruct the Kulitalai Talug Overseer to inspect the District Munsiff's Court House at Kulitalai and report whether the building can be repaired, and to give a rough approximate Estimate of what will be the Cost for putting it in good order –

2 – From the Judge's letter it appears that the building is a private one, but as the Overseer is on the spot he can furnish the information required without loss of time

I have &c
(Signed) J. Beatty Lieutt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

(True Copy)
Offg. Executive Engineer Trichy.

P.W. 3050/81
36

Executive Engineer's Office
15th January 1881

No. 3377

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

To,
The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly -

Enclo - 2 -

Sir -

With reference to your letter No. 1238 L.C / 20-12-80 the enclosure to which is herewith returned I have the honor to forward for your information copy of a letter No. 316 dated 9th instant from the Overseer in charge of Kulitalai Taluq regarding the Condition of the District Munsiff's Court House at Kulitalai -

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

(True Copy)

C. Norfor
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

Ph. 3050/81
35

Reply from the Superintending Engineer 3d Circle to the Division Officer's letter No. 3377/15-1-81 ent

No. 1389 I.C./22-1-81 Memo

The undersigned has the honor to request the Executive Engineer to take the earliest opportunity of inspecting the Building and reporting on it himself — When there is an Officer in charge of a Division the report of a subordinate should not be submitted except under exceptional circumstances.—

The Overseer's report omits all mention of the most important information required, namely, the state of the walls and foundations, and a rough sketch with dimensions showing the extent of accommodation available.— If the Executive Engineer considers the building dangerous the District Munsiff should at once be advised to discontinue using it.— From the Overseer's report it is impossible to judge whether the building is really unsafe or not—

(Signed) L. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engr. 3d Circle

(True Copy)

Offg. Executive Engineer Trichy. Dn.

Executive Engineer's Office
28th January 1881-

No. 3551

From The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To, The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

P.W. 3050/34

Sir

Enclo - 1

I have the honor to inform you with reference to your memo No. 1389 S.C. dated 22-1-81 (herewith returned) that I am not a little surprised at your telling me that my Subordinate's report should not have been submitted.- As it was at your particular request as conveyed in your No. 1238 S.C of 20-12-80 that the Overseer was asked to report upon the building-

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

Superintending Engineer's Endorsement on Division Officer's letter No. 3551/28-1-81.

No. 1440 T.C./2-2-81.

The undersigned regrets to find that he objected without reason through forgetfulness, but requests the Divisional Officer to furnish a more complete report after inspecting the building himself –

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer

(True Copy)

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

A.

P.W. 3050/87
32

P.W. 3050/87
30

No 4192

From,
The Offg Executive Engr
In Sp. of Irrig. Dn

To
The Supt Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Dated 17th } March/81
Received }

En - 3.

Forwards a serious complaint against the Head Clerk of the Supdg. Engineer's Office preferred by the Sr. accountant & Head Clerk of the Divisional Office—

Head Clerk and [illegible] took place at my house in the presence of Draftsman Subramonia Chettiar.

3. I have examined Contractor Ayasawmy Pillay and Sub overseer Arunachellam Pillay and enclose their evidence almost word by word as given by them—

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant

Offg. Executive Engineer
In Sp. of Irrig. Dn

1

Enclosure 1.

No 4192 17th March /81.

From,

The Offg Executive Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly Dn.

To,

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to forward a serious complaint against the Head Clerk of your office signed by the Head Accountant and Head Clerk of this office. Enclo-3. They both complained to me in December last regarding the 3 per cent required by your Head Clerk, on all Estimates, but I took no notice of what they told me as I thought it may perhaps be only a "got up" complaint, but lately matters have taken such a turn as to lead me to believe that there must be some truth in their complaint.

2. It was not long ago that your Head Clerk, immediately the Estimate× for the 21st Barracks was sanctioned, came to me & begged of me to give the contract to a particular person. I informed him that if he did get it he would have to abide

×amounting to Rs 3,950

head Clerk. It would be observed from our Service Registers that we never had occasion to such a warning during the whole period ~~from~~ our Service in the Department.

6. Although it is not our desire to bring complaints against the Head Clerk yet we do so because we are afraid that by the Hd Clerk's constant misrepresentations to the Deputy Engineer, we will have some day or other entangled in danger of ruin.

We beg to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most obedt &
humble servants

Accountant
Trichinopoly Dn Office
10/3/81

Hd Clerk
Trichinopoly Dn Office

11/3/81

Enclosure 1.

17

Enclosure 2

To
C. A. T. Norfor Esquire
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Most Honored Sir

We the undersigned most respectfully beg to bring the following to your notice on the Conduct of the Head Clerk of the Supdg Engineer's office and to request that the same may be submitted to the Supdg Engineer for his regular enquiry and final disposal.

2. On several occasions the Hd Clerk requested us to collect & pay him 2 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Division. This we brought to your notice sometime in Dr last. This sort of dealing being quite against our Conscience we informed him repeatedly that we will never interfere in the matter

---

P.W. 3050/81
26

Enclosures marked B

1. Correspondence relating to the submission of returns –
Supdg Engrs No 1984 S.C. of 24/12/80 – Ex. Offrs No 3235 of 4/1/81 with
Do — 2270 S.C. of 15/2/81 – Do — 393½ of 26/2/81 with enclosure.
Commissioner's No 29. D.C. of 13/4/81 — Do — 181 of 18/4/81 with 1 enclosure.

2. Do — Do. relating to Public Buildings which are not on the Books
Supdg Engrs No 1547 S.C. of 28/2/81 – Ex. Offrs No 600 of 5/3/81
" — 1596 S.C. of no date – Do — 126 of 10/3/81

P.W. 3050/81
18

be
mo
las
trea

Superintending Engrs. Office
No. 1547. T.C. Trichinopoly 28th February/81

To,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

Memo

Reference - This Office Nos. 1803 T.J. & 1344 T.C. of the 22d. November 1880, and 14th January 1881 respectively -

Requests that the report called for in the above in connection with the Public Buildings which are not on his Book may be forwarded at once as the Chief Engineer has sent in a reminder for it. -

2 - This is another instance of the very great delay that occurs in obtaining information from the Trichinopoly Division Office - The Head Clerk should be warned that if such delays are not put a stop to, it will be necessary to remove him, and put some more efficient person in his

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg. Executive Engineer Trichy Dn.

(True Copy)

P.W. 3050/81
28

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Endorsement by the Supdg. Engineer
on Division Officer's letter No. 600/3-3-81

No. 1596 T.C

Memo

The undersigned has the honor to request the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly will be good enough to report the name of the subordinate more immediately responsible—

It was clearly the duty of the Head Clerk to see that some reply was given within a reasonable time to a requisition of this Office—

(Signed) I. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer 3d Circle—

(True Copy)

Offg. Ex. Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

P.W. 3050/81
27

No. 626 –

Executive Engineer's Office
12 10th March 1881
Despd 14

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

To

The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir –

In returning your Endorsement No. 1596 T.C. of no date, I have the honor to inform you that I was waiting for Mr. Macalister's list of Public Buildings in the Madura District.

2 – You did not call upon me for Explanation as to cause of delay in the non-submission of this return and therefore no Explanation was afforded: – If this Office failed in its duty to supply information not asked for then I beg to state that your Office had equally failed in its duty in not calling for Explanation apparently required.

3 – You again throw blame on my Head Clerk; but I beg to point out that my Head Clerk does not dispose of my correspondence with you; and in this particular instance

instance if he had drafted a letter explaining the Cause of delay I should probably not have passed it, so please therefore do not blame him.

4- I sent you the Return for the Trichinopoly District with this Office No. $\frac{4060}{9\text{-}3\text{-}81}$ and therein stated that the return for Madura had not been received. I forwarded this to you as you told me and I believe my Head Clerk also that you wanted it.

forwarded

5- From the report received this day from the Supervisor in charge of Madura Sub Dn it is understood that in the Madura District there are no buildings which fall within the category of Public Buildings, & which are not on the books this Office; there are also no unauthorized esidences in that District

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

Offg Ex: Engr Trichy Dn

3050/81
18

instance if he had drafted a letter explaining the cause of delay I should probably not have passed it, so please therefore do not blame him.

4 - I sent you the Return for the Trichinopoly District with this Office No. $\frac{4060}{9\text{-}3\text{-}81}$ and therein stated that the return for Madura had not been received. I forwarded this to you as you told me and I believe my Head Clerk also that you wanted it.

forwarded

5 - From the report received this day from the Supervisor in charge of Madura Sub Dn. it is understood that in the Madura District there are no buildings which fall within the category of Public Buildings, & which are not on the books of this Office; there are also no unauthorized residences in that District.

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Morfor
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichy. Dn.

(True Copy)

Clliffe

Offg. Ex. Engr. Trichy. Dn.

3050/18

P.W. 3050/81
26

My Hd Clerk is here blamed when he was not to blame.
C.H.

---

be constituted a 4th Class Division.

This year we have to look after more works in the Madura District than last; the Accountant has been under treatment at the Hospital here.

I have &ca

(Signed) C. H. T. Harper
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Divn

(True copy)

C Harper
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Divn.

P.W. 3050/81.
18

B

No. 181

Trichinopoly Dn. Office
18th April 1881
Despd. 19th

From
The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Examiner of P. W. Accounts
Madras

Sir

Enclo-1

In reply to your letter No. 29 S.E. 32 of 13th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that there is no doubt that the Accountant has far more work to do than the Accountants of the other Divisions of the Circle, but this is only a 2nd class Division; the expenditure in this Division including Local Funds & Madura is greater than the expenditure of any other Division in the Circle. I do not, therefore, see how he can be blamed in any way. I have a good opinion of him, & know he works hard. I can't give him more than one Asstt.; he also brought this point to the Examiner's notice on his inspection of this Office in October last. So long as Local Funds remain in our charge I am decidedly of opinion this should

neverth

of the year

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

P.W. 3050/81
19

6 - I beg to add that I would ere long fall a victim to some disease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the Civil Dispensary.

I beg &ca.
(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant - Trichy. Dn. Office

No. 24
Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No. 2 of 9th Instant.
(Signed) C. H. T. Gosfor
Offg. Exec. Engr. Trichy. Dn.

(True copy)
Offg. Exec. Engr. Trichy. Dn.

No. 181

Trichinopoly Dn. Office
18th April 1881
Despd. 19th

From
The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Examiner of P. W. Accounts
Madras

Encls-1

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 29 S.E. 32 of 13th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that there is no doubt that the Accountant has far more work to do than the Accountants of the other Divisions of the Circle, but this is only a 2nd class Division; the expenditure in this Division including Local Funds & Madura is greater than the expenditure of any other Division in the Circle. I do not, therefore, see how he can be blamed in any way. I have a good opinion of him, & know he works hard. I can't give him more than one Asstt.; he also brought this point to the Examiner's notice on his inspection of this Office in October last. So long as Local Funds remain in our charge I am decidedly of opinion this should

---

Supdg. Engineer's endorsement on G. O. No. 2825 W dated 7th December 1880.

No. 1984 T.J.

Similar Endorsement was sent to all Dns. except South Arct.

Forwarded to the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, who is requested to report without delay on the several causes that may have delayed his Accounts during the past six months, & state what arrangements he has made for submitting them in good time in future without fail.

It may be that the accounts are not closed early enough, or there may be unnecessary delay in the submission of accounts on the part of the Overseers, who should be fined, & if necessary reported for dismissal if they cannot obey orders, or it may be owing to the inefficiency or negligence of the head Accountant; or the Divisional Officer possibly does not arrange to be in head quarters on the proper date for signing & despatching them. These & all other points should be fully reported on.

(Signed) J. L. Beatty Lieutt. Coll. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer, 3rd Circle.
24-12-80.

(True copy)

Offg. Exec. Engr. Trichy. Dn.

No. 181

Trichinopoly Dn Office
18th April 1881
Despd 19th

From
The Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Examiner of P.W. Accounts
Madras

Enclo–1

Sir

In reply to your letter No 29 S.E. 32 of 13th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that there is no doubt that the Accountant has far more work to do than the Accountants of the other Divisions of the Circle, but this is only a 2nd class Division; the expenditure in this Division including Local Funds & Madura is greater than the expenditure of any other Division in the Circle. I do not, therefore, see how he can be blamed in any way. I have a good opinion of him, & know he works hard. I can't give him more than one Asstt; he also brought this point to the Examiner's notice on his inspection of this Office in October last. So long as Local Funds remain in our charge I am decidedly of opinion this should

never

181

Supdg Engineer's endorsement on G. O. No 2825W dated 7th December 1880.

No 1984 T.J.

Similar endorse-ment was sent to all Dns except Trich. and

Forwarded to the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, who is requested to report without delay on the several causes that may have delayed his Accounts during the past six months, & state what arrangements he has made for submitting them in good time in future without fail.

It may be that the accounts are not closed early enough, or there may be unnecessary delay in the submission of accounts on the part of the Overseers, who should be fined, & if necessary reported for dismissal if they cannot obey orders, or it may be owing to the inefficiency or negligence of the head Accountant; or the Divisional Officer possibly does not arrange to be in head quarters on the proper date for signing & despatching them. These & all other points should be fully reported on.

(Signed) J. F. Beatty Lieutt Coll R.E.
Supdg Engineer, 3rd Circle.
24-12-80.

(True copy)

Offg Exec. Engr Trichy Dn

Trichinopoly Dn Office

Pl. 3050/81
25

No 3235
4-1-81
Despd 5/Do

From,
The Offg Executive Engineer
In chge of Trichy Dn

To,
The Superintg Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

In reply to your endorsement No 1984. S.J. dated 24th ultimo on G.O. No 2825 W. dated 17th idem I have the honor to inform you that my Head Accountant tells me that previous to the amalgamation of the Madura District with this, the accounts of the Trichinopoly Division, as a rule, went in, in proper time, but that since the amalgamation they have not been submitted punctually. He states that the Madura records are in a very confused state & that much of his time as well as that of the office estt is taken up in searching for references &c. I have warned the Hd Acctt to be more punctual for the future. I find that the accounts from subordinates come in in very fair time.

The accounts could as easily be despatched from my camp as from Head Quarters, so that my not being at

Office

Head Quarters would not be an excuse for the accounts being late. I have signed them in camp over & over again in other Districts & submitted them to the Examiner in proper time.

I would suggest now that Madura is amalgamated with Trichinopoly that an extra Clerk be appointed to assist my Head accountant. When this District was divided into 3 Divisions there were 3. accountants & 6. Clerks. The strength now is 1 Accountant & 4 Clerks although Madura is attached to the District as a Sub Division. It should also be remembered that L. F. works are retained by the D.P.W. in this District.

I have the honor &c.
(Signed) C. H. F. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engr
In charge of Trichy Dn

P.W. 3050/M
24

Similar
endorsement
was sent
[illegible]
except [illegible]
[illegible]

Supdg Engineer's endorsement on G.C. No. 70W dated 12th January 1881.

No. 2270 T.J.

Forwarded to the Executive Engr Trichinopoly Division, who will be good enough to furnish this Office with a full explanation of the cause of delay in the submission of the monthly Accounts for October & November.

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieutt Col. R.E.
Supdg Engr, 3rd Circle

15th February 1881.

(True copy)

Offg Exec Engr Trichy Dn.

P.W. 3050/81
23

No 3934

Trichinopoly Dn Office
26th February 1881
Despd 27th

From
The Offg Exe Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

Encl 1

With reference to your endorsement No 2270 T.J. dated 15th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that I have no further explanation to offer than to refer you to my letter No 3235 dated 4th January 1881 -

2 I have also addressed the Examiner regarding the arrears of work in this Office, vide my letter No 3833 dated 17th Instant, copy of which is herewith sent for your information.

I have &ca

(Signed) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

P.W. 3650/81
23

No 3934

Trichinopoly Dn Office
26th February 1881
Despd 27th

From
The Offg Exec Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Encls 1

Sir

With reference to your endorsement No 2270 I.J. dated 15th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that I have no further explanation to offer than to refer you to my letter No 3235 dated 4th January 1881 –

2 I have also addressed the Examiner regarding the arrears of work in this Office, vide my letter No 3833 dated 17th Instant, copy of which is herewith sent for your information.

I have &ca
(Signed) C. H. T. Igorfor
Offg Exec Engn Trichly Dn

(True Copy)
Cllnp
Offg Exec Engn Trichly Dn

Rr. 3050/81
22

B

No. 3833

Executive Engineer's Office
17th February 1881.

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To
The Examiner of
P. W. Accounts
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice that my Office work (account branch) has fallen into arrears. Replies to several audit notes and references are to be attended to. This could not be done by my Accountant in addition to his current work. Under these circumstances I request that you will be good enough to order an additional accountant to attend my Office till such times as the arrears are brought up and the accounts for March next are despatched to your Office.

The cause of the arrears complained of is partly owing to the Local Fund Works not having been excluded from this Division and partly to the amalgamation of the Madura Sub Division with this Division. No extra hands for this purpose were sanctioned for.

I.

I cannot attribute the fault to my accountant or to my Office Establishment as I know they work hard and beyond Office hours.

I have &c.

(Signed) C. H. T. Monfor

Offg Exe Engineer.

(True copy)

Offg Exe Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Pr. 3050/81
4

No. 29 S.E. 3rd

From The Examiner P.W. Accounts
Madras

To The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Madras 13th April 1881

Sir

I have the honor to return herewith the Accountants explanation in regard to the present arrears in the accounts work of your office, received with your endorsement No. 24 of the 6th Instant, & to request that it may be resubmitted with such remarks as you may consider necessary on each of the points adverted to by the Accountant.

2 On the close of the Easter holidays I shall arrange to send you for a temporary period another accountant, & hope you will with the additional assistance, be able soon to bring the whole of the Accounts work of your Office up to a satisfacto state.

I have &ca

(Signed) J. C. Gardon
Officer in charge Examiner P.W. Accounts O

(True copy)

Offg Exe Engr Trichy Di

P.W. 3050/81
20

To The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir
As directed in para 2 of the Examiner's letter No. 885. S.E. 3rd dated 30th March 1881 to submit full explanations for the delay that has occurred in replying to Audit notes from June 1880, I respectfully beg to state that the delay is not attributable to laxity on my part in the discharge of the duties, but to the heavy work in the Division, & to the causes hereunder mentioned.

2 The various duties appertaining to me & the cause of heavy work in the Division have been briefly explained in my replies to the several queries embodied in the Examiner's letter No. 800 S.E. 3rd dated 4th March 1881, & also in the list of Accounts submitted to the Examiner from October 1880. The retention of Local Fund works and Minor Irrigation works, which most of the other Divisions in the

Presidency have not.

3 The Accountant in the Division is allowed only one Clerk to aid him in the compilation of Accounts, & partly the amalgamation of Madura Division (the records & Accounts of which are in a most confused state) entail a vast amount of labor, & could not work properly with the limited Establishment. With his aid there is hardly time to submit the Monthly Accounts to the Examiner within the due date, in spite of working 9 hours every day including Sundays, & other authorized holidays. The main cause of the accumulation of much arrears in this Division I beg to submit that it is owing to the want of sufficient assistance; and this I have explained in person to the Examiner when on his tour of inspection in October last, & also the difficulties I have to encounter in the preparation & compilation of Monthly Accounts with the aid of one Assistant who could in no way cope with the emergency of the time. Your honor having been an eye witness to the heavy pressure of current duties in the Division you have been pleased to request the Examiner in letter No. 3833 dated 17th February 1881 to depute an additional Accountant to attend this Office till such period as the arrears are brought up, & the Accounts for March are despatched for the reasons therein stated

4. You have now been pleased to direct me to pay special attention to the prompt disposal of several Audit Notes that have been accumulated from June 1880, but in attending to them I fear that the current work would be much retarded, notwithstanding any assistant being vigorously engaged on it. The month of March being the close of the Official year your honor is cognizant of the fact that the transactions would be of a more complicated nature, & the work heavier than in other months

of the year.

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

P.W. 3050/81
19

6. I beg to add that I would ere long fall a victim to some disease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the Civil Dispensary.

I beg &c

(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant - Trichy Dn Office

No 24

Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No 2 of 9th instant.

(Signed) C. H. J. Foster
Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

(True copy)
Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

50/81

of the year.

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

P.W. 3050/81
19

6 - I beg to add that I would ere long fall a victim to some disease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the Civil Dispensary.

I beg &ca

(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant - Trichy Dn Office

No. 24
Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No. 2 of 1st instant.

(Signed) C. H. J. Foster
Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

(True copy)
Offg Exe Engr Trichy Dn

No. 2198.
Trichinopoly 2d October/80
Despd 3d

From,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division
To,
The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

Reference. This Office No. 486 dated 15th May 1880.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that Sub Overseer Gopala Iyengar was relieved of his duties in the Musere Taluq on the afternoon of the 28th Ultimo to take up his Local Fund appointment in the Tanjore District.

I beg to suggest that Chockalingam Pillay appointed in your No. 624 T.C dated 20th August last to act for Santha Pillay 3d Grade Sub Overseer may be confirmed in the room of Gopala Iyengar and S. Annasawmy Pillay

Compd.
O.C.

Supg Engineer 3d Circle -

who was lately employed as Maistry on Irrigation and Local Fund works, who understands English and who is capable of holding the Sub Overseer's post may be appointed to act for Santha Pillay.

I have &c

(Sd) C. H. T. Norfor.
Offg Exe: Engineer
In chge of Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

R Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

Compd

P.W. 3050/81
14

No 3083: 21st December/80
Despd 22d

From,
The Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

To,
The Supg Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No 3030/16-12-80, I have the honor to inform you that Chokalingum pillay holds very good testimonials, & appears to have been employed as Accountant and Draughtsman, & lastly as Sub Overseer. He in my opinion, is fully capable of holding the appointment for which I recommended him. The chief cause of his not having been well spoken of by Mr Hutchings is, I believe, due to his ill health during the period he was employed in the late Madura Division.

2: Under these circumstances I request that you will be good

Supg Engineer 3rd Circle -

enough to appoint him (Chokalingum pillay) permanent Sub Overseer in the place of Sasha Iyengar, whose Services were dispensed with under the orders of the late Supg Engineer (No 809 I.C dated 6th January last).

3. If this is approved by you I request that S. Annasamy Pillay, whom I have recommended in my letter No 2198 dated 2d October 1881, may be appointed to act for Santha pillay during his absence on special duty.

I have &c

(Sd) C. H. L. Norfor
Offg. Exe: Engr Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

J. Beatty. Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Compd
BR

P.L. 3050/81
13

Supg Engrs Office 3d Circle
No 1323 I.C Trichinopoly 8th January/81
Debd 10th

Memo

His letter No 3083 of the 21st December/80

Under the circumstances reported in the above letter the undersigned sanctions the proposals recommended by Mr Norfor. Chokalingam Pillay's appointment in place of Seshiengar will be on probation for 6 months and if at the end of that period he is reported upon favorably he will be confirmed in the post.

Annasamy Pillay will act for Santha Pillay until further orders.

(Sd) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

(True Copy)

J. Beatty. Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Compd
BR

P.Lr. 3050/81
12

H

Copies of correspondence
regarding Sub Overseer
Chokalingam Pillay
and Annasawmy Pillay

P.Lr. 3050/81
12

G

Extract from the
Superintending Engineer's
letter to the Chief Engineer
P.W.D. regarding the
Tanjore Accountant.

Ph. 3050/81
12

H

Copies of Correspondence
regarding Sub Overseer
Chokalingam Pillay
and Annasawmy Pillay

Ph. 3050/81
12

G

Extract from the
Superintending Engineer's
letter to the Chief Engineer
P.W.D. regarding the
Tanjore Accountant.

Extract from a letter from the Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated Thotur 14th February /81 No. 2265 I.J

× × ×

If the Accountant of the Tanjore Division does not complete his accounts in good time in future, I shall request the Examiner to transfer him elsewhere on a reduced pay.

× × ×

(True Extract)

E. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle

Comped.
DVC

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division regarding accounts -

Extract from a letter from the Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated Kotur 14th February /81 No. 2265 T.J.

× × ×

If the Accountant of the Tanjore Division does not complete his accounts in good time in future, I shall request the Examiner to transfer him elsewhere on a reduced pay.

× × ×

(True Extract)

C. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle

Compd.

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division regarding accounts -

Extract from a letter from the Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated Thotur 14th February /81 No. 2265 I.J

× × ×

If the Accountant of the Tanjore Division does not complete his accounts in good time in future, I shall request the Examiner to transfer him elsewhere on a reduced pay.

× × ×

(True Extract)

L. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

Compd

Supt. Engineers Office 3rd Circle
Camp Pelandorai.

No. 763 I.W 14th December 1880
Despd. 18th - do

~~From,~~
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle.

To,
The Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

Sir,

In forwarding the enclosed copy of G.O. No. 2689 W of the 23rd November 1880 I have the honor to request you will be good enough to furnish the explanation called for in para 4 of the G.O as to the cause of deposits of previous years not being utilized. and the report called for in clause 2 of the same para as to why the expenditure of Manur anicut has not been recorded in the Register of works since April last; the name of the person responsible for this neglect, should also be furnished at an early date. Any explanations you may wish to make about the seeming neglect on your part should be furnished as soon as possible for submission to the Chief

Engineer

2. I shall be obliged by your also reporting how the jail accounts are now kept, and what arrangements can be made to meet the suggestions of the Examiner in order to curtail the amount of labor in maintaining the Register of works, and why no work vouchers have been submitted with the accounts of the Palamcottah jail.

(Signed) J. J. Beatty Lieutt Colnl
Supg Engr 3d Circle.

(True copy)

J. Beatty. Lt Col. R.E
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division regarding accounts -

---

P.W. 3050/81
10

E

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer South Arcot Division regarding the Head Accountant of that Division -

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division regarding accounts -

---

Superintending Engineer's Office
3d Circle Trichinopoly
No. 1093 St 17th March 1881
Despd 19th — do —

From,
The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

To
The Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division

Sir,

With reference to your No. 141 of the 24th February 1881 I have the honor to inform you that the Register of Works for works below Rupees 10000 must be retained in all Divisional Offices as prescribed in the New Code. It is not intended that the accountants in each Divisional Office should be left alone to compile the accounts of a Division. One clerk should be left entirely at the disposal of the accountant and if this is found insufficient the Storekeeper who has comparatively little to do in his own Department should be ordered to assist the accountant with these assistants the accountant should be able to maintain the Registers of works &a and if he cannot do this it will be advisable to ask the Examiner to transfer him Elsewhere and Send a man who has been found up to Such work.

2 I have further to point out to you that if the Store Keepers place in a Divisional Office has been filled in by a thrown out Head accountant, the Services of this man will be of great assistance to the accountant.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servt.
(Signed) J Beatty Lieut Col RE
Supg. Engineer 3d Circle.

(True Copy)

J Beatty Lt Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Pl. 3050/81
10

E

Copy of letter to
the Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division
regarding the Head
Accountant of that
Division -

Pl. 3050/81
9

D.

Copy of G. O. P.W.D.
of 1875 - regarding Mr
Norfor -

P.W. 3050/81
10

E

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer South Arcot Division regarding the Head Accountant of that Division -

---

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
P.W. Department. 7th May 1875.

Read the following letters:—

No. 148. From J. W. Rundall Esqre District Engineer, Tinnevelly, to Col. G. W. Walker R.E., Chief Engineer P.W. Deptt., dated Palamcottah, 20th March 1875, No. 192.

I have the honor to inform you that Mr. C. Norfor Assistant Engineer, in charge of the Courtallum Sub-division has in a letter, dated the 17th Instant, requested that I would apply to you for his transfer to another Tamil District.

2. Mr. Norfor states that he desires this change "on account of the ill health he has experienced in this district off and on."

3. I have never known Mr. Norfor to be under medical treatment, and am disposed, therefore, to attribute his desire for a transfer to his having been censured by me for sending in

certain Irrigation Repair Estimates, many details of which were quite unintelligible.

4. Should you wish to see these Estimates as a specimen of Mr. Norfor's capacity, I will forward them to you, but otherwise hardly like to trouble you with them.

5. As the district will not be weakened by Mr. Norfor's transfer to another, I beg to recommend it.

6. As the northern Range has but little new work, either Imperial or Local, and as Mr. Supervisor Beslie has prepared more Estimates for Agricultural Repair Works than it is probable we shall have funds to carry out during the next two years, I would propose to transfer him to the Shermadevi Range as Sub-division Officer, and hold the Streevilliputur Sub-division in abeyance for the present.

7. Mr. McNair, the Northern Range Officer, is thoroughly acquainted with the Range, and will, as long as the allotments are as low as they are likely to be next year, be able to superintend all work.

No. 149. From the same Officer, dated Camp at Putthugude, 9th April 1875.

No. 10.

1. List of Documents (containing six enclosures).

I have the honor, at the request of Mr. C. Norfor, Assistant Engineer, attached to this District, to forward, herewith, a letter to your address, with two enclosures.

2. Mr. Norfor complains, firstly, that I misrepresented him in stating that his application for a transfer was due to his having been censured rather than to ill health.

3. The reasons for my opinion were that Mr. Norfor's Application was written on the day he received the censure referred to, and that I had never known him either under medical treatment or suffering from ill health.

4. Mr. Norfor complains, secondly, that I have "ventilated his inefficiency" to Officers of Revenue Department, and forwards copies (including one letter of his to me, written but never sent) of correspondence with regard to two

cases in which I blamed him, and in which when the Collector and Sub Collector found fault with the departmental work, I stated when replying to them that Mr. Norfor being inefficient I could not be responsible. I still feel that I should be very sorry to be held responsible for the manner in which Mr. Norfor performs his duties.

5. As a further reference on the subject of Mr. Norfor's inefficiency has now been made by Mr. Norfor himself, I forward, though reluctantly, the Estimates referred to in my letter, No. 192, of the 20th March. To my mind these Estimates and Mr. Norfor's explanations show that he is unfit for the post he holds. If Mr. Norfor would in cases like this take his notes to the Range Officer and prepare Estimates under his instructions, there would be some hope for him; but he insists on doing things his own way, generally does them wrong, and when found fault with considers himself ill-treated.

6. I should mention that these Estimates were called for by the additional Sub Collector who had inspected the works referred to and noted generally what appeared to him to be wanted.

7. The Estimates, my notes in returning them, and Mr. Norfor's replies, are forwarded.

8. The Estimates were sent in by Mr. Norfor without any explanation or description of what was either wanted or proposed.

9. In one place Mr. Norfor estimates for a Masonry Revetment wall to protect a channel from Erosion 3 feet thick for a height of 2½ feet. This is marked (a) on the estimate and notes. Although I pointed out that this could hardly be required, Mr. Norfor still considers such a thickness "absolutely necessary".

10. In another case marked (b) Mr. Norfor estimates for a thickness of 10 inches with a height of 3 feet. This is probably a mistake, as a different thickness and different height also is entered in the Specification

I mention this to show how very troublesome it is to revise Mr. Norfor's estimates and correct his complicated errors.

11. Mr. Norfor estimated for masses of Concrete (to stop leakage) without any reference to what they are to be founded on; and, if made in accordance with either his first or his amended Specification, the Concrete would certainly be a failure.

12. In the case of certain estimates for repairing the irrigation works of Tharapanadi river, I went over the works with Mr. Norfor and gave him full notes regarding the preparation of the estimates. When received these were also in many cases unintelligible, and had to be revised by Mr. Grant.

13. Similarly most of Mr. Norfor's Estimates require as much trouble expended in revising them as would suffice to make them out originally; hence in this respect at least he is of no assistance to his Range officer.

14. Were I remaining in the district, and not about to go on furlough, I should venture to make Mr. Norfor's removal a special request, as I have no hope of his being a useful member of the district staff.

Order thereon, 7th May /75 No. 1294

No. 150

Establishment No. 16.

Mr. Norfor's request for removal to another district will be complied with, as it is contemplated by the District Engineer to hold the Streevillipatur Sub-division in abeyance. But from perusal of the correspondence sent up to the Chief Engineer, at Mr. Norfor's own request, on this and on a former occasion, His Excellency the Governor in Council has been led to form a most unfavorable opinion of that gentleman competence for the work of the Department. And finding that his name stands high on the roster for promotio to a senior grade, he considers it nec sary that his period of probation shall be extended before he attains it. He will consequently be reduced in rank to a place amongst the Assistant Engineers of the 2nd Grade just above the gentlemen who have lately been appointed from Cooper's Hill; and he is warned not to expect promotion to the first grade till reported by competent Authority fit for Range charge. Further report of continued incompetence will involve dismissal from the Department.

2. The Chief Engineer will arrange for his further employment.

(True Extract)

(Signed)

G. W. Walker Col. R.E.
Secretary to Govt.

(True Copy)

E. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

Plr. 3050/81
9

D

Copy of G. O. P.W.D.
of 1875 - Regarding Mr.
Norfor -

Plr. 3050/81
8

C

Supg Engineer's
revised Decision

Ph. 3050/81
9

D

Copy of G. O. P.W.D. of 1875 - Regarding Mr. Norfor -

Revised Decision in the matter of the charge brought by the Head Clerk Cundaswamie Pillay and Head Accountant Muthuswamie Naidu of the Trichinopoly Division against Parancoosam Naidu Head Clerk Superintending Engineer's Office.

Vide demi official dated 4th May/81 -

To meet the wishes of the Examiner, and taking into consideration the strong feeling displayed by Mr. Norfor against Parancoosum Naidu which probably misled and tempted his subordinates, the Supg. Engineer has decided to modify and moderate the sentence he pronounced on the persons engaged in the recent false charge against Parancoosum Naidu.

Cundaswamie Pillay lately Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division will be reduced from a pay of Rs 60 in Trichinopoly to Rs 40, as Second Clerk in South Arcot Division office.

Arunachellam Pillay Sub Overseer 3rd Grade will be suspended for one month and transferred to the Musiri Sub Division; a Sub Overseer of the 3rd Grade being transferred from Musiri to Trichinopoly to take his place.

Muthuswami Naidu will be transferred to the Examiner's Office on a reduced pay of Rs 40, but will do duty in the Trichinopoly Division Office until he is relieved

The original decision will hold good as regards Contractor Iyaswami Pillay.

C. Beatty. Lt Col. R.E.
Supy Engineer 3d Circle

Kodikanal
12th May 1881

l

tions

for-

P.W. 3050/81
8

C

Supg Engineer's
revised Decision

/81

P.W. 3050/81
7

B

Demi Official
letter from the
Examiner —

tio

for

P.W. 3050/81
8

C

Supg Engineer's
revised Decision

/81

P.W. 3050/81
7

B

Demi Official
letter from the
Examiner -

tions

for-

Plr. 3050/81
7

B

Demi Official letter from the Examiner -

---

3 Enclosure. 3. L.B.

About 2 months ago as I was going to the Divl. Stores to get a Levelling Instrument for levelling in the [illegible] alum Tank the Supdt: Eng.'s Head Clerk was walking in the verandah near the Office - he saw me & called me & conversed with me abt: his sister's marriage and the extra expenses that had occurred during the marriage - he also told me that he has requested the Hd. Clerk & Acct:nt the Divl. Office to collect a percentage for him

Pl. 3050/81
7

He told me that it is he that had recommended Curedasamy for the Head Clerk's Post in this Dist. and that it was through his influence that Muthusamy Naidoo was transferred from the Examiner's office to this office - I did this, [illegible] thinking they wd: be of great assistance to me, but now they are not so - and he requested me to advise them not to gain his displeasure - I said very well & will inform them and accordingly I did so.

Pl. 3050/81
6

3rd Gr: Subordinate

15/3/81

---

2 Enclosure to L. B.

I am a Contractor in this District my name is Iyosamy Pillay - The Supt: & Manager called me abt: 2 months ago, during Panguni & asked me if I gave the Bursar or the Dist. Office people any percentage on the contracts that I got - I re-plied that I gave nothing - to all which the Hd. Clerk said, on all the Contracts on the same - but I believe that the Dist. office people get something from all - please do inform the Dist. Office Hd. Clerk that I have already spoken on the matter to him & I have also sent [illegible] word through some other [illegible]

P.W. 3050/81
7

dividuals & if he does not
yield to my request & give
a percentage ~~they~~ he will get
my displeasure — He also
informed me that he gets
percentage regularly from
the other 4 Divisions —
He told me I must bring
him an answer soon — I
immediately informed the Dist.
Hd. Clerk who told me that
he would not interfere in the
matter. I did not go again
to the Supt: Eng's Head Clerk —
I informed this to the Dist. Head Acct:
also —

Ct 14/3/81 G. Ramasamy Pillay

P.W. 3050/81
5

Enclosure 5

I went to Muthusamy Pillay's
house abt: 10 days before, when I
saw ~~the~~ Muthusamy conversing
with Seenevassa Pillay and
Ammasamy Pillay & I heard him
tell them that Seenevassa Pillay
Cundasamy Pillay & Sesha-
mania Pillay are great friends —
& this is the course which gives
vacation to the Hd. Clerk after
Supt: Eng's office — I left the
house while the other two individuals
Sreenevassa Pillay & Ammasamy Pillay
were conversing —

Kistnasamy
2nd Clerk Div. Office Trichy
14/3/81 —

C. B.
28/3/81

P.W. 3050/81
7

P.W. 3050/
4

Enclosure 6

I did not hear Pensioned Clerk Muthusawmy Pillay tell anybody that the Hd Clerk of the Supt: Engr's Office told him that the Divl: Hd Acct: and Hd Clerk not having complied with his request about getting 3 per cent on all Bills then he was going to recommend their transfer to the Supt: Engr: but I heard him say that Munisami alias Ramanujulu Naidoo was going to be the Supt: in the new organization — I heard this about a week or ten days ago — ~~I did not~~ Muthusawmy Pillay conversed with his Sreenivasa Pillay inside his (Muthusawmy's) house — I was outside on the pyal — I don't

EXAMINER

Plr. 3050/81
7

know what they were talking about -

This is Annasamy's not signed Plr. 3050/81
3/

Sthanasamy Pillay

2 6/3/81

L.B.
28/3/81

~~Enclosure 8~~
Enclosure 7

About 10 days ago Annasamy Pillay Govinda Samy Pillay & Shenavasa Pillay & Kistnasamy Pillay came to my house & told a festival - I did not mention ~~his~~ ~~name~~ of Annasamy Pillay's name to the Supt: Gov Manager's name in connection with any matters - They used to be great friends, but I don't know if they are so now - I did not mention the Dist. Head Accts' name to any official or body that day. I am

A. Krishnasamy
Ponnuswamy Naidu

L.B. 28/3/81

P. Lr. 3050/81
1

P. Lr. 3050
2

EXAMINER

Enclosure 8

I heard from Muthusawmy Pillay that the Supt: Engr's Office Hd Clerk has letters wherein that he had given sufficient riggings to Kundasawmy Pillay, Hd Clerk of the Dist. Office and he has spoken to the gentleman abt: him & he has also consented to transfer him on reduced pay very soon — He informed that he has also made a report to the Govt: abt: Muthusawmy Naidoo that this will be transferred & that to take effect very soon.

J. P. Govindasawmy Pillay

14-3-81.

C. B.
28/3/81

C. B.
28/3/80

EXAMINER
4 MAY 81
P.W. ACCOUNTS

P.W. 3050/81
1 to 6.

A

(6.) Original Depositions
taken by Mr. Norfor-

No. 4192. 17: March 181.

From,

The Offg Exec: Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly Dr.

To,

The Superintending Engineer
IIIrd Circle. Trichinopoly

Encls: 3.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward a serious complaint against the Paramcoosam Naidu Head Clerk of your office signed by the Head Muthusami Naidu Accountant and Cundasami Head Clerk of this office. They both complained to me in December last regarding the 3 per cent Paramcoosam required by your Head Clerk, on all Estimates, but I took no notice of what they told me as I thought it may perhaps be only a "got up" complaint, but lately matters have taken such a turn as to lead me to believe that there must be some truth in their complaint.

2. It was not long ago that Paramcoosam your Head Clerk, immediately

10. On the other hand the accused possesses first-rate testimonials from the following officers:—

Colonels Wilkieson, Lawford, Roberts, & Sankey;

Lieut. Col. H. L. Prendergast;

Major G. M. Payne;

and Messrs R. C. Dobbs, J. D. Grant, W. Hughes, J. W. Martin, and J. W. Rundall. At the last reorganization, Mr. Rundall specially selected Parancoosam Naidu for his present post in preference to others of longer service.

11. The Supg. Engineer considers that Cundasamy Pillai and Muthusami Naidu have totally failed to substantiate the very serious charge they brought against a man of the highest character. The charge of course was brought for the purpose, and apparently in expectation, of ruining Parancoosam Naidu. If it had been proved, he must have been dismissed. But the charge has not been substantiated and the Supg. Engineer believes it to be false. He has no doubt that the four persons Cundasami Pillay, Muthusami Naidu, Arunachellam Pillay, and Ayasami Pillay have been guilty of a malicious conspiracy to ruin Parancoosam Naidu.

12. Such being the case it becomes necessary to decide what punishment is most suitable in the case of conspirators, such as these men have proved themselves to be, so as to deter others like

Cundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu are asked to explain how the collection was to be made, they declare they have not the least idea. Now either the charge is false, as the Supg Engineer fully believes; or these men were lying when they said they did not know how the collection was to be made. In either case they are untrustworthy & unfit for the Government Service -

[illegible]

7. Then as to their reason for bringing the (written?) charge; viz; lest he should do them some harm; ie, by misrepresentations to the Supg Engineer; they are unable to adduce a single instance in which a member of the office Establishments has been unfairly dealt with.

[illegible]

8. Cundasa Pill

not be accepted in any court of law.

5. The brazen-faced confession of the principal witness (para 22 of the Proceedings), that he had once acted the part of informer against his immediate superior, is enough to stamp the character of the man. He seems to have brought a false charge on that occasion too.-

But this informer [illegible] !!

6. Again the charge is that on several occasions Parancoosam Naidu asked Cundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu to collect for him 3 per cent on all contracts; and their witness Ayasami Pillay further states that this percentage is paid to Parancoosam Naidu by all other Divisions - But when

witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4); and
does not produce the deposi:
:tions of the other 4 witnesses
(Enclosures 5, 6, 7, 8) until these
are specially called for by the
Supg Engineer. ......

3. It is also observed that
Mr Norfor in December 80,
thought the charge against
Parancoosam Naidu might
be a "got up" complaint; but
lately, for the reason given
in para 2 of his letter ap:
:parently, he believes "there
must be some truth in it".
That reason is that Paran:
:coosam Naidu endeavoured
to get his friend Mr Dudley
entrusted with the execution
of some work on contract;
and although Parancoosam
Naidu did this openly, using
only fair means, and failed
to get his friend any work, Mr
Norfor considers this is a
reason for believing that the
charge against Parancoo:
:sam Naidu is true; i.e. that
he did attempt to extort fees
or bribes. The Supg Engineer,
on the contrary, considers this
to be, in fact no reason at
all. ...

4. As regards the specific
charge against Parancoosam
Naidu, the most definite State:
:ments are those made by
his two accusers as given
in their joint letter (Enclo: 2),
and the depositions of their
two principal witnesses (Enclo:
:sures 3 + 4). But, as in each
case the witnesses depose to
something that happened when
nobody else was present, the
evidence is, in the opinion
of the Supg Engineer, perfectly
worthless, and such as would

not be accepted in any court of law.

5. The brazen-faced confession of the principal witness (para 22 of the Proceedings), that he had once acted the part of informer against his immediate superior, is enough to stamp the character of the man. He seems to have brought a false charge on that occasion too.

But this informant seemed to know if [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] turned out [illegible]!!

6. Again the charge is that on several occasions Parancoosam Naidu asked Kundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu to collect for him 3 per cent on all contracts; and their witness Ayasami Pillay further states that this percentage is paid to Parancoosam Naidu by all other Divisions. But when

41. Does not know how Parancoosam Naidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors, and never delivers cheques to Contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.

43. His brother in law is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr. Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arunachellam Pillay.
4. — Do — of Ayasami Pillay.
5. — Do — of Kristnasami Pillay.
6. — Do — of Annasami Pillay.
7. — Do — of Muthusami Pillay.
8. — Do — of Govindasami Pillay.
9. Mr. Norfor's 2d letter.

K. Beatty. Lieut. Col. R.E.
28th April 1881. Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle

ill-feeling between him and Mr. Fonseca was that he reported to Mr. O'Ratigan that Mr. Fonseca's cash balance was short. [illegible]

23. The 4th Witness, Ayasami Pillay, a Contractor in the Trichinopoly Division, was then called. 4th

24. The evidence he gave before Mr. Morfor (Enclosure 4) was read to him and he adheres to it.

25. States that his conversation with Parancoosam Naidu took place in the Verandah of the Supg. Engineer's Office and that no other person was present. He is not a particular friend of Cundasamy Pillay or Muthusami Naidu, and did not get a house for Cundasami Pillai.

No proof that it is [illegible]

26. The 5th Witness, Kristnasami Pillay, 2d Clerk in the Division Office, was then called. The evidence he gave before Mr. Morfor was read to him. He adhered to it, and acknowledged his signature. (vide Enclosure 5) 5th

[illegible]

27. The 6th Witness, Annasami 6th

that otherwise he would do him

Pillay, late acting Sub Overseer was next called. His evidence given before Mr. Morfor (vide Enclosure 6) was read to him. He accepted it as correct and signed it.

28. Cross examined by Parancoosam Naidu. Says he never was spoken to by Parancoosam Naidu about Cundasamy Pillay or Muthusami Naidu. The latter asked him to give evidence against Parancoosam Naidu; but did not say what evidence he was to give. Did not tell Srinivasa Pillay that Parancoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Muthusami Naidu and Cundasami Pillay.

7. 29. The 7th Witness, Muthusami Pillay, a pensioned Clerk was then called, and his evidence (Enclosure 7) was read to him and he accepts it as correct.

30. Says he is a friend of Parancoosam Naidu, and of Muthusami Naidu and Cundasami Pillay. Parancoosam Naidu never spoke to him about Muthusami Naidu

3

or Cundasami Pillay. Did not tell Srinivasa Pillay about the proposed transfers as stated in Srinivasa Pillay's evidence.

31. The 8th Witness, Govindasami Pillay, Draftsman (assistant) in the Division Office was then called; his evidence before Mr Horfor was read to him and he accepted it as correct. 8

32. Lastly, Muthusami Naidu and Cundasami Pillay were examined by Paraucoosami Naidu.

33. Muthusami Naidu said his conversations with Paraucoosami Naidu about collecting money for him took place when no body was present. Horfor was [illegible] ??

34. Did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division Officer.

35. Never receives fees when he hands over cheques to Contractors.

36. Says Paraucoosami Naidu asked him for fees on the ground that otherwise he would do him some harm.

37. That at the time of sending in the annual report on the accountants, Paraucoosami Naidu told him that the Supg Engineer asked whether he (Paraucoosami Naidu) was satisfied with Muthusami Naidu and that Paraucoosami Naidu said he was satisfied.

[illegible]

38. He would not have made a written charge but that he was afraid of misrepresentations being made against him. Admits that Paraucoosami Naidu by his representations can do nothing; but he represents himself as being able to do so.

39. Cundasami Pillay, the Head Clerk of the Division Office was then called:—

Wallace ?? 40. States that there were no persons present when Paraucoosami Naidu asked him to collect money

41. Does not know how Parancoosam Naidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors, and never delivers cheques to Contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.-

43. His brotherinlaw is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.-

---

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arunachellam Pillay.
4. — Do — of Ayasami Pillay.
5. — Do — of Kristnasami Pillay.
6. — Do — of Annasami Pillay.
7. — Do — of Muthusami Pillay.
8. — Do — of Govindasami Pillay.
9. Mr Norfor's 2d letter.

K. Beatty - Lieut. Col. R.E.

28th April 1881. Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

to ruin him; Srinivasa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Kundasamy Pillay.

16. Says he heard nothing about the percentage. But he heard from Annasami Pillay that Parancoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Accountant Muthusami Naidu, also for Kundasamy Pillay's transfer on reduced pay, and that orders would be passed in a week. Annasami Pillay also said that Parancoosam Naidu got Kundasamy Pillay employed in the Superintending Engineer's Office Madura, and promoted to his present post, and that notwithstanding this he had shown himself ingrateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthusami Pillay a pensioned Clerk.

17. Srinivasa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Parancoosam Naidu and

41. Does not know how Parancoosam Naidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors, and never delivers cheques to Contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.-

43. His brotherinlaw is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.-

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arunachellam Pillay.
4. Do of Ayasami Pillay
5. Do of Kristnasami Pillay
6. Do of Annasami Pillay
7. Do of Muthusami Pillay
8. Do of Govindasami Pillay
9. Mr Norfor's 2d letter.

K Beatty Lieut Col R.E.

28th April 1881. Supg Engineer 3d Circle

to ruin him; Srinivasa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Cundasamy Pillay. 3

16. Says he heard nothing about the percentage. But he heard from Annasami Pillay that Parancoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Accountant Muthusami Naidu, also for Cundasamy Pillay's transfer on reduced pay; and that orders would be passed in a week. Annasami Pillay also said that Parancoosam Naidu got Cundasamy Pillay employed in the Superintending Engineer's Office Madura, and promoted to his present post, and that notwithstanding this he had shown himself ingrateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthusami Pillay a pensioned Clerk.

17. Srinivasa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Parancoosam Naidu and

Proceedings of an enquiry held at Trichinopoly on the 7th April 181, into a charge made by Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay and accountant Muthusami Naidu, against Head Clerk Parancoosam Naidu.

The charge is contained in a letter dated 10th March 181, addressed to the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly and runs as follows:—

2. "On several occasions the Head Clerk" (meaning Parancoosam Naidu the Head Clerk of the Superintending Engineer's Office) "requested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to contractors employed in this Division."

3. The letter in question was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, by the Executive Engineer Mr C. H. T. Norfor, who stated that he believed in the truth of the charge.

4. It became therefore necessary for the Superintending Engineer to hold an enquiry into the case under para 948 of the P. W. Code.

5.

No 4316. 28th March/81.

From,

The Offg Exec Engineer
In ch: of Trichinopoly Dt

To,

The Supg Engineer 3d Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir,

Enclos 4.

With reference to your letter No 1692 T.C dated 25th Inst, I have the honor to forward herewith the enclosed four depositions taken from the individuals noted in the margin.

1. Deposition taken from Draftsman Govindasamy Pillay.
2. — Do — Do — 2d Clerk Kristnasamy Pillay.
3. — Do — Do — Late ag Sub Overseer Annasamy Pilly
4. — Do — Do — Pensioned Clerk. Muthusamy Pillay.

Please take the deposition of your Clerk Streenivasa Pillay

I have &c

(Sd) C. Norfor.
Offg Exec Engineer
In ch: of Trichy Dt

A.B.

2nd Draftsman E.E

[illegible] Pensioner Paramoothalu

I heard from Muthusamy Pillay that the Supg Engineer's Office Head Clerk was telling to him that he had given sufficient urgings to Cunda-samy Pillay, Head Clerk of the Divisional Office and he has spoken to the gentleman about him and he has also consented to transfer him on reduced pay very soon. He informed that he has also made a report to the Govt about Muthusamy Naidu to be transferred and that will take effect very soon.

Accts

/sd/ Govindasamy Pillay

14/3/87.

G.B.

Pensioned Clerk -
About 10 days ago, Annasamy
acting Subovers[illegible]
Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay &
2nd Draftsman S.E.'s Office
Streenivasa Pillay and Kristna
samy 3rd Clerk S.E. Pillay came to my
house to go to a festival. I
did not mention of Kundasamy
Head Clerk S.E. Pillay's name or the Supg
Paramcoosamy Engineer's Manager's name
in connection with any matters.
They used to be great friends,
but I do not know if they
are so now. I did not mention
the Division Head accountant's
[illegible]
name to any body that day.
I am a friend of Paramcushm
Head Clerk S.E. Naidu -

(sd) A. Muthusamy

Pensioned Clerk -
About 10 days ago, Annasamy
acting Subordinate
Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay +
2nd Draftsman S.E's Office
Streenivasa Pillay and Kristna
:samy Pillay came to my
3rd Clerk S.E.
house to go to a festival. I
did not mention of Cundasamy
Head Clerk S.E.
Pillay's name or the Supg
Engineer's managers name
Paramcoosam
in connection with any matters.
They used to be great friends,
but I do not know if they
are so now. I did not mention
the Division Head accountant's
Muthusamy Sastri
name to any body that day.
I am a friend of Paranoosh
Naidu -
Head Clerk S.E.

(Sd.) A. Muthusamy

Pensioned Clerk –

About 10 days ago, Annasamy
acting Subverseer
Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay + Streenivasa Pillay and Kristna
2nd Draftsman E. E's Office
:samy Pillay came to my house to go to a festival. I did not mention of Cundasamy
3rd Clerk S. E.
Head Clerk S. E. Pillay's name or the Supg Engineer's manager's name Paramoosam in connection with any matters. They used to be great friends, but I do not know if they are so now. I did not mention the Division Head accountant's name Muthusamy Naidu to any body that day. I am a friend of Paramoosh Naidu – Head Clerk S. E.

(Sd) A. Muthusamy

Circle 1
Statement
dated 14-5-81

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

The humble Appeal of C. M. Aroonachel
Pillay 3d. Grade Suboverseer Trichinopoly Division
against the decision of the Superintg. Engineer
3d Circle Trichinopoly.

Most Honored Sir.

1. With profound respect & humble submission I most respectfully beg to lay befo your honors generosity my grievances with my humble prayers that justice may be rendered I, the most helpless and unfortunate creature may thus be protected.

2. I am a Government servant of 18 year standing in the Department, and during th above period I have behaved my self to the entire satisfaction of my superiors under whom I was put to serve on different occasions. My service register recorded in the Trichinopoly Division office will bear out my Statement.

3. I am sorry to apprize your Majesty that I was unfortunately and unjustly dismissed by the Supg. Engineer 3d Circle under the plea that I have committed the guilty of malacious conspiracy to ruin his Head Clerk Paramoosam Naidoo.

4. I most respectfully beg to submit tha on the day of enquiry of the Complaint brough against Paramoosam Naidoo Head clerk of the Supg. Engineers office by the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Executive Engineer's office

I was Examined as a witness in support of the charge thereof. The statement given by me is a fact what had really and actually told by Head Clerk Parangoosam Naidoo. For telling the truth but nothing but the truth of what had taken place between myself and Parengoosam Naidoo I am dismissed from the Government Service.

I therefore most humbly and respectfully solicit your honor's generosity will kindly take my deplorable circumstances into your honor's merciful Consideration and protect me and my poor large family ordering my restoration to my appointment after perusing the statement herein enclosed for your honor's valuable information.

For this act of Charity and benevolence I shall as in duty bound ~~will~~ ever pray.

I humbly beg remain
Most Honored Sir
Your Honor's Most Obt. Servt.
Amtrodnachellum
late 3d Gr. Sub Overseer of
Trichinopoly Division

14 May 181
Trichinopoly

P.W.C. No. ~~2998~~

No 3156/1

Recd. 18 May

Enclo: 1

From
A. M. Arunachellum Pillay
late 3rd Gd. Sub Overseer
Trichinopoly Divn
3rd Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department
Madras

Appeal of Arunachellum Pillay 3rd Gd. Sub Overseer Trichy Divn. against the Decision of the Supdg Engineer 3rd Circle Trichinopoly

C.E. No. 1249 d/ 18 May/81.
To the Supdg Engineer 3rd Circle for report

R. H. Sankey
C.E.

18 May/81

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 3RD CIRCLE,
Trichinopoly 24/5/1881.

No. 270 T.C
Despd: 25th

From,
Lieut. Col. J. Beatty R.E.
Superintending Engineer, 3rd Circle,

To,
Col. R. H. Sankey C.B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Enclo: 1.

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement No. 1249 of 18th Inst. on 3rd Grade Sub Overseer Arunachellam Pillay's petition, herewith returned, I have the honor to refer you to my letter No. 211 T.C of 16th Instant, with which the full particulars of the case in question have been given.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedt. serv

J. Beatty Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3rd C

AS.

P. W. C. No. 3156

P. W. D. 3rd Circle.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

3rd Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.

No. 270 T.C

Dated 24th } May 1881
Received 27th }

Enclosures. Nil

Sub overseer Arunachellam Pillay

Returns petition of – and states that the full particulars of the case are given in the letter of the 16th Instant –

Papers P.W. 3015

put up.

0

0.28.5.81

R101

No. 455

Executive Engineer's Office
Trichinopoly 14th May 1881.

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

To
The Chief Engineer
Public Works Departt.
Madras

Sent to Madras
13-6-81

Sir

With reference to G. O. No. 1072 W of 25th April 1881 I have the honor to request that, as no opportunity was afforded to me to offer an explanation on the Superintending Engineer's letter No. 28 T.C of 8th April 1881 to your address (which letter I have not as yet seen) I beg you will not relieve me of Charge of this Division until my explanation has been obtained & disposed of – If instructions have already been issued for my relief kindly interfere by Telegram

2. The matter being extremely urgent, I send this direct, for which I beg to be excused –

3. A Copy of this letter

[illegible]

I

File submitted.
appeal from Mr. Norf
not yet heard disposed of

R.S. 3/6

O.L.S. 25/5

G. P. W. MS. No. 3006.

From
The Offg Exe Engr.
Trichinopoly Dn

To
The Chief Engr.
P. W. D.

Dated 14th }
Recd } May 1881

No. 455

Memo No. 141 of 7th June
1881.

Requests not to relieve him of the Trichinopoly Division till his explanation on G O No. 1072 W of 25th April 1881 is obtained and disposed of.

16-5-81

7/6/81

To,

C. H. J. Norfor Esquire
Offg. Exec Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

Most Honored Sir,

We the undersigned most respectfully beg to bring the following to your notice on the conduct of the Head Clerk of the
Paramcoodeam Supg. Engineer's Office and to request that the same may be submitted to the Supg. Engineer for his regular enquiry and final disposal.

2. On several occasions the Head
Paramcoodeam Clerk requested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to contractors employed in this Division. (This we brought to your notice sometime in December last). This sort of dealing being quite against our conscience we informed him repeatedly that we will never interfere in the matter

Govt P. W. Ch.

R.S. 25/5

CAW

Let me have the file connected with the charges preferred against Colonel Beatty's manager &...

30/6/81

W.

Submitted.

R.S.
30/6

Memo No. 120 of 30th May 1881

CWP 2998/315

Petition from C. M. Aroonachellum Pillay, late 3rd gr. Sub-Overseer, Trichy Dt. of 14th May 1881 appealing agst the decision of the Supg. Engr. 3rd Cir: in his dismissal.

The Chief Engineer has, on a careful review of the whole case, declined to interfere with the decision of the Supg. Engineer.

(Sd.) R. H. Sankey Col. R.E.
Chief Engr.

(Int.) R.S.
Caw.

Despd 30/5

To
C. M. Aroonachellum Pillay
late 3rd gr. Sub-Overseer
Trichy Dt.

and that if he wishes he may collect the required percentage himself from the Contractors. On this the Head Clerk sent word Paramesvaram to us through Contractor Iyasamy Pillay and Sub overseer Arunachellam Pillay on two different occasions in the month of January last that if we do not yield to his request we will have to undergo his displeasure. The above said Iyasamy Contractor and the Sub Arunachellam Overseer may be questioned on the point and their evidence taken in writing in your honor's presence and sent on to the Supg. Engineer with this petition.

3. The second and Streenivasen third Clerks of the Supg. Engineer's Office are also well aware of the cause of ill feelings between ourselves and the Head Clerk and we believe that they will not hide what they really know if they are asked to state the fact on oath.

4. The Head Clerk a week or 10 days ago was telling to one Pensioned Clerk Muthusamy Pillay who is living at Puthur that as we have failed to comply with his request, he had suggested to the Supg. Engineer regarding our transfers and that the result will be known very soon. Muthusamy Pensioned Clerk Pillay told this to the individuals marginally noted ⊗ – If all these persons were questioned this point will be proved.

⊗ (1) Govindasamy Pillay, 2nd Draftsman Dr. office.
(2) Streenivasen Pillay, 3rd Clerk Supg. Engrs. office.
(3) Kristnasamy Pillay, 2nd Clerk in the Dr. office.
(4) Annasamy Pillay, Ag. Sub Overseer. 3rd Grade.

5. From the above circumstances we form an idea that the Head Clerk is very much ill disposed towards us and this is the cause of several unbearable warnings and threats which we were lately obliged to receive from the Supg. Engineer who, it is believed, should have been misrepresented by his head Clerk. It will be observed from our Service Registers that we never had occasion to such warnings during the whole

period of our service in the Department.

6. Although it is not our desire to bring complaint against the Head Clerk yet we do so because we are afraid that by the Head Clerks constant misrepresentations to the Superintending Engineer, we will have some day or other entangled in danger of ruin.

We beg &c.

|sd| G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant. Trichy Dn office.
10/3/81.

|sd| K. Cunthasamy
Hd Clerk. Trichy Dn Office.

|Ind| C. N.
11.3.81.

L.B.

[illegible]

About 2 months ago as I was going to the Divisional Stores to get a Levelling Instrument for levelling in the Kollaitingalum Tank the Supg Engrs Head Clerk Paramasawmi was walking in the Verandah near the Office, he saw me and called me and conversed with me about his sisters marriage and the extra expenses that had occurred during the marriage. he also told me that he has requested the Head Clerk and Cundasawmi Accountant of the Division Muthusawmi office to collect a percentage for him. He told me that it is he that had recommended Cundasamy for the Head Clerk's Post in this Division and that it was through his influence that Muthusamy Naidu was transferred from the Examiner's Office

to this office. I did this, he said
thinking that they would be
of great assistance to me,
but now they are not so, he
requested me to advise them not
to gain his displeasure. I
said very well I will inform
them and accordingly I did so.

/Sd/ C. M. Arunáchellam
3rd Grade, Sub overseer.

15/3/81.

/Sud/ C. h.

I am a Contractor in this Dist
and my name is Iyasamy Pilly
Paraucoosamy The Supg Engineer's Manager
called me, about 2 months ago,
during Pongul and asked me
Ensecs if I gave the overseer or the
Division Office people any
percentage on the contracts
that I get. I replied that I
gave nothing. To which the
Paramesvaram Head Clerk said, Ah all the
contractors say the same, but
I believe that the Dn Office
people get some thing from
you all, please go & inform
the Division Office Head Clerk
Annasawmi that I have already spoken
in the matter to him and I
have also sent word through some
other individuals and if he does
not yield to my request and
give a percentage he will get
my displeasure. He also in=

formed me that he gets percentage regularly from the other 4 Divisions. He told me I must bring him an answer soon. I immediately informed the Division Head Clerk, Cundasawmi who told me that he would not interfere in the matter. I did not go again to the Supg Engr's Head Clerk. Paramcoosam- I informed this to the Division Head Accountant also. Muthusawmi Naidu

Sd/ G. Iyasamy Pillay

Bndf C. H
14. 3. 81.

L.B.

2nd Clerk E.E's office-

I went to Muthusamy Pillay Pensioned Clerk house about 10 days before, when I saw Muthusamy 2 Clerk Pensioned Clerk conversing with Seenevasa Pillay 3rd Clerk S.E's office and Annasamy acting Subovrseer Pillay and heard him tell them that Seenevasa 3rd Clerk S.E. Pillay, Cundasamy Hd Clerk E.E office Pillay and Subramonia Pillay are great friends. and this is the cause which gives vexation to the Head Clerk of the Supg Paramcoosam Engineer's Office. I left the house while the other two individuals Srinivasa Pillay + Annasamy Pillay were conversing.

Sd/ Kistnasamy
2nd Clerk. Dn Office. Trichy
14/3/81.

L.B.

acting Sub-overseer

I did not hear Pensioned
Clerk Muthusamy Pillay tell
anybody that the Head Clerk
Paramagosamy
of the Supg Engineer's office
told him that the Divisional
Head Muthusami Naidu accountant and Head
Candasamy Clerk not having complied
with his request about gettin
3 per cent on all Estimates, h
was going to recommend their
transfer to the Supg Engineer,
but I heard him say that Na-
:rasimulu Naidu was going
to be re-entertained in the Dept
in the new organization. I hea
this about a week or ten day
Pensioned Clerk ago. Muthusamy Pillay con-
:versed with Sreenivasa S.W. Clerk S.E. Pilla
— do — inside his (Muthusamy's) hou
I was outside on the pyal. I
dont know what they were
talking about.

L. B.

|sd| Annasamy Pillay
26/3/87.

Para 17 of General remarks	I humbly beg
He has no doubt that the four persons, Kunda sawmy Pillay, Moothoosawmy Naidoo, Aroonachellum Pillay & Dyasawmy Pillay have been guilty of malicious Conspiracy to ruin Paranjoosum Naidoo	not in any way directly or indirectly con with Parangoosam Naidoo I had no nece to have a Conspiracy to ruin him. I am sorry & at a loss to understan under what grounds the Supg. Engineer h arrived at this Conclusion. There is no in the Supg. Engineer's decision to show the reason under which I am considered to h committed the guilty alleged by the S Engineer. Parangoosam Naidoo has no any way given a proof to the Supg. Engin to enable him to arrive at that Conclusion

Chitroo Nachellum
late 3rd Gr. Subovers
14 – 5 – 81

(First at Proceedings) that he had once … I do not consider that my character was

Statement given before the Supg. Engineer 3d Cle	Remarks & Decision of the Supg. Engineer 3d Circle	Protest of the Sub-overseer against the decision of the Supg. Engineer
Statement given by Overseer Mr Fonseca Para 10 of the Proceedings Also that while Aroonachellum Pillay was his writer in the Madura Distt he (Aroonachellum Pillay) made use of a document to which Mr Fonseca's initials were forged. Mr Fonseca considers Aroonachellum Pillay an untrustworthy person.	Remark opposite to Para 10 of the Proceedings This man, it will be observed, is the 3d witness and apparently his evidence was strongly relied on in support of the charge.	I most respectfully and submissively to submit that the Statement given by Overs Mr Fonseca before the Supg. Engineer was to me on the day of Enquiry. I then raised objection to the Overseer's Statement & infor the Supg. Engr. that it was not the case. I req the Executive Engineer in my letter No April/81 to call upon the Overseer to or to produce any such record to substa his statement on the subject, & in case failure to permit me to take a crimin action against overseer Mr Fonseca for giving a false ~~and~~ statement with a vi blemishing my character. My letter was forwarded to the Supg. Engineer for his but, I regret to state that the Supg. Engr. has been pleased to call upon the Overseer to statement nor taken the trouble of

---

W. 8 - E.W. Encls 6

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W.D with the remark that Mr C.H.T. Norfor's conduct is considered to be inexcusable. The orders given by the Superintending Engineer were in themselves quite proper and Section 315 of the Code in no way supports Mr Norfor's proceedings

[illegible] Col
Chief Engineer for [illegible]

31/3/81

No 881 d/ 2d April/81
To The S.E. III Circle thro C.E. for I.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1697. T.C. d/ 25 March/81, I have the honor to remark that ~~it~~

It is clear that Mr Norfor has misunderstood the Code ruling para 315 as Colonel Beatty's order was specific and the duty of yielding implicit obedience to such is distinctly enjoined therein. Even in the absence of any such instruction in the Code, the impropriety of setting aside the order of the Superintending Engineer ought to have been sufficiently clear to Mr Norfor, and I trust he will take this distinct

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 3RD CIRCLE,
Trichinopoly 25/3/1881.

No. 1697 T.C.

Irrigation

From,
Lieut: Col: J. Beatty R.E.
Superintending Engineer, 3rd Circle,

To,
Colonel R. H. Sankey C. B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P. W. D.
thro: the Chief Engineer for Irrign

Enclo: 6.
1. Collr's No 748/10.3.81 with 3 Enclosures (To be obligingly returned).
2. Copy of letter to Exec: Engr No 1635 T.C./15.3.81.
3. Copy of Exec Engr's No 4245/20.3.81.

Sir,

I have the honor to request you will be good enough to instruct the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly to carry out my instructions in regard to the works referred to in his letter No 4245 of 20th March 1881.

2. Mr Norfor has taken advantage of a certain para of the Public Works Code to refuse compliance with what I consider a reasonable request. There was no question of "putting all minor works into working order

---

Kindly address the Chief Engineer as to the necessity of handing over works in good order, in the meanwhile I shall cause a search to be made amongst the records of my Office regarding the new Channel said to have been cut without reference to the Revenue Department, as it seems hardly likely that this Deptt could have done so, without a requisition from either the ryots or Revenue Officials.

I have &c

(Sd/) C. H. T. Norfor
Offg Exe: Engineer
Trichinopoly Dt

(True Copy)

J. Beatty. Lt Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
28 MAR
1881

C III/10 T.C.
6

No 2091/1

CHIEF ENGINEER
20 MAR
1881
FOR IRRIGATION

No. 2091/81

No. 4245. 20th March 1881

From

The Offg. Exe. Engineer
In chge of Trichinopoly Dn.

To,

The Supg. Engineer
3d Circle

Sir,

In reference to your Memo No. 1635+ I.C. dated 15th Instant, I regret to state that by the authority conveyed in Section 315 of the P.W. Code, I must defer compliance until the matter is decided by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. His instructions conveyed in Memo No. III/270 of 25th January /81 are clear and absolute and contain no reservations of any kind.

+(The four enclosures received are returned)

If we have to put all minor works into working order before handing them over to the Revenue Deptt. it will take years before they are off our hands.

Kindly

No. 1635 I.C.

Supg Engrs office 3rd Circle
Camp Periyakulam
15th March /81

From
The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle

To
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

With reference to the accompanying correspondence, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to estimate for the work proposed by the Assistant Collector, viz, reopening the old Kowakudi channel as it seems to me that in such a case this Department is bound before handing channels over to the care of the Revenue Department to do what may be needed to put them in a working condition

I have &c

(Sd) J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

(True Copy)

J. Beatty Lt Col RE
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

Enclos 4

1 - Collr's No 748 to the Supg Engineer 10-3-81
1 - Asst. Collr's No 172 5-3-81
1 - Do No 104 to the Exe-Engr 11-2-81
1 - Exe-Engr's No 3803 to the Asst Collector 14-2-81
4 To be returned.

---

arrangement must be made at once and some kind of a staff supplied for the works which they now give up. I have already written on the subject in my report on the scheme for handing over works to Rev. Department (vide my letter No. 340 of 2nd July 1880)

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

CHIEF ENGINEER
28 MAR
1881
FOR IRRIGATION

R VII
10 I.C.
4

No 2091/81
3

188

From
~~The Collector~~ Asst Collector
Trichinopoly.

To
The Collector
Trichinopoly

Date. 5th
Despd. } March 1881.
Recd.

No. 172
Enclosures 2

Forwards for orders copies of correspondence between himself and the Executive Engineer with re[gar]d to the execution of certain works.

6.3.81.

~~Have received~~ [illegible]

Assistant Collector.

File

Send to Supg Engr.

7.3.81.

TRICHINOPOLY, COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,
10th March 1881.

No. 748

From
The Collector
of Trichinopoly.
To
The Superintending Engineer
Trichinopoly.

SIR,

In forwarding in original (to be returned) letter No 172 dated 5th March 1881 & its enclosures from the Assistant Collector, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to cause the works therein referred to to be carried out.

2. I would point out that the abandonment of an existing branch Channel and opening a new one from the Pengunni Channel alluded to in the Assistant Collector's letter No 104 dated 11th February 1881 to the Executive Engineer were carried out by your Department without reference to the Revenue Department. It therefore seems to me that the defects in the new channel complained of should also be remedied by your Department.

I have the honor to be,
Your most obedient servant,
H. S. Jacob
for Collector.

CHIEF ENGINEER
22 MAR

R III
10 I.C
1

Pr 2091/81
6

188/.

From
The Collector
Trichinopoly.

To
The Supt Engineer
Irrig

Date. 10 } March 1881.
Despd.
Recd.

No. 7-82
Enclosures 3

Regarding to
remove the
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Supt Engineer 3rd Circle

Assistant Collector's Office
Trichinopoly. 11th February 1881

No 104.

From
The Assistant Collector
Trichinopoly

To.
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

Sir,

I have the honor to call your attention to certain defects in the irrigation under the Pongumi from the branch channel in the limits of Kothamangalam & to request that measures may be taken to remove them.

2. The facts of the case are as follows. There were originally 3 branches in Pangumi in the limits of Kothamangalam, the first or the Southern branch for the irrigation of the villages on the Methupatti side, the 2nd or the Northern branch for the villages in the Kullikudi side, & the 3d or the Middle branch for Thinniyam village. In 1877 the 2nd branch was abandoned and the 3d was widened as far as the limits of Sirumayagudi village, where a regulating dam was constructed and a new branch from the Dam was formed, for the irrigation of Konnakudi, Senbari, Mullal, Kullikudi Alingudi and Pattai villages, which were

before irrigated by the abandoned branch. As this new branch was dug rather deeper than the old branch, there has been ever since then a difficulty in getting water for Komakudi, Sembari, and Mullal villages whose fields are on a higher level.

3. The changes appear to have been made by the D.P.W, but why and under what circumstances I have no means of discovering.

4. This difficulty was brought to the notice of the Sub. Engineer to whose range these villages belonged by the Tahsildar of Trichinopoly in his Yadast No 176 of 14 July 1877. To this he received a reply in Yadast No 131 of 17 Idem, that "a memo was sent to the Overseer to prepare Estimates". The Tahsildar again sent reminders in the yadasts noted in the margin. To these no replies were received.

No 83 of 12 March/78.
No 57 of 13 Mar/79.

5. As nothing has been done to remedy the defects and as the villages suffered much from want of water to their fields, the Tahsildar made a temporary arrangement to take water to the fields of the above said 3 villages by throwing temporary bunds across the channel.

6. This practice of course gave rise to complaints from the villagers lower down, who found their water supply obstructed & diminished by the use of these bunds.

There have been constant water disputes over the matter & one of these coming before me for disposal last year I personally inspected the spot. I found that from the fact of the fields of the Komakudi village being higher than the bed of the channel, it would obtain no water supply at all unless some sort of bunds across the channel was allowed.

It is impossible therefore to prohibit the erection of bunds under the present system - & so long as they are allowed there are certain to be constant disputes over the water supply between the different villagers. To prevent disputes at present as a temporary measure I made an arrangement, agreed to by all the villagers under the branch channel, by which a certain time for blocking the channel by the people of each village was fixed and at the same time promised to remedy the defects in the ensuing hot season if possible.

What the villagers require and

what I myself think will be the best course is to reopen the old Komakudi channel from above the new Regulating dams for Komagudiory. If this is done from a place where there is proper level for irrigating the fields of the Komakudi village there will be no need for blocking the branch channel as was heitherto done. There will then be sufficient water for the fields of the other villages and there will be an end to all the existing disputes.

If you agree with me in thinking this the best remedy for the existing difficulty I think the cost of restoring the old channel should be borne by Government & the work completed by the D.P.W. If you think that this cannot be done at once i.e in the ensuing dry season, or if there is any reason why it should not be done at the cost of Govt, the ryots will I am sure be willing to undertake the completion of the work themselves at their own cost provided the place is marked out by the D.P.W.

It is also reported to me by the

Bx-2091/84
6

Tahsildar that the Natvoikal (the middle branch) and the Nettupatti branch run parallel & very close to each other & that in the limits Sirumayangudi the bund between them is very thin, and that the Nettupatti villagers take advantage of this & very often cut through the bund in order to let more water into their channel. I request that this place may be ordered to be inspected and the bund strengthened as you may think proper & made safe.

The matter which is one of some importance has been pending in the hands of the officers of your Department for the last 3½ years. There are constant disputes and quarrels for water amongst the ryots. The arrangement that I have made can only be a temporary one & was agreed to by the ryots on the understandi that a permanent remedy shoul be given as soon as possible. I therefore request that you will be goo enough to give early attention to this subject and inform me what you propose to do at your earliest convenience.

I have &c.

Signed/ H. C. Joseph.

Asst. Collector.

AC

(True copy)

CHIEF ENGR. 20 MAR 1881 FOR IRRIGATION

R III / 101 C. / 2

H. C. Joseph

Asst. Collector

B 2091/81 / 5

CHIEF ENGINEER 28 MAR 1881 FOR IRRIGATION

R III / 101 C.

188

Trichinopoly Office

From

The Offg. Executive Engr. in charge of Trichinopoly Dn.

To

The Assistant Collector Trichinopoly

Dated. 14th }
Despd. 15th } Feby 1881
Recd.

No. 3803

Enclosure.

Former Reference.

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 104 of the 11 Instant I have the honor to inform you that I have received an order from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation that

---

TRICHINOPOLY, COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

188 .

No.

From

The ~~Collector~~ Assistant Collector

of Trichinopoly.

To

The Collector of Trichinopoly

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith Copies of my letter No. 104 of 11th Instant to the Executive Engineer and his reply to it No. 3803 of 14th idem and to request that you will be good enough to inform me by whom the works such as are therein referred to should be done for the future.

2. The change referred to in my letter appears to have been made by the D. P. W. and shortly after this the defects noticed were brought to their notice but they have so far done nothing to remedy and the Ex Engineer now declines to take any steps in the matter at all.

If an order has been received that the D. P. W are to attend only to Imperial Works Same district arrangement must be made at once and some kind of a staff supplied for the works which they have give up. I have already written on the subject in my report on the scheme for handing over works to Revd. Department (vide my letter No. 340 of 2d July 1880)

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

H. S. Smith

Assistant Collector.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
28 MAR
1881

R. III
10.
4.

No. 2091
3

~~I have received no orders yet but expect [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]~~

[illegible]

File

Subd to Supg Engr.
7.3.81.

188

From
Asst Collector
The ~~Collector~~
Trichinopoly.

To
The Collector
Trichinopoly

Date. 5th
Despd.
Recd.
} March 1881.

No. 172
Enclosures 2

Forwards for orders Copies of Correspondence between himself and the Executive Engineer with regard to the execution of certain works.

Sub. Papers
6.3.81.